DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 513 IR 008 114

AUTHOR	Miller, Stuart Wayne
TITLE	Library Use Instruction in Selected American Colleges. Occasional Papers No. 134.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Graduate School of Library Science.
PUB DATE	Aug 78
NOTE	49p.
AVAILABLE FROM	University Graduate School of Library Science, Publications Office, 249 Armory Bldg., University of Illinois, Champaign, IL 61820 ($2.00 prepaid, 10% discount on 10 or more of the same title)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Libraries; *Library Instruction; *Library Services; *Library Skills; Program Descriptions; Program Development; *Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

Limited to programs aimed at undergraduate students in American college libraries, this paper describes the development of the concept of library skills instruction and discusses current instructional programs in 13 colleges: Brown, Washington and Lee, Manhattanville, Occidental, Dillard, Dickinson, Oberlin, State University College at Brockport/SUNY, Swarthmore, University of Richmond, Eastern Michigan University, Wabash, and the University of Colorado. The following general patterns in the approach to library instruction are ascertained: (1) a positive relationship may exist between the amount of student library use and library use instruction; (2) course-related instruction enjoys more popularity than separate courses; (3) library instruction requires either more library personnel and/or time specifically allocated for instruction; and (4) in order to receive financial support, librarians must cultivate support among the faculty in their institutions. References and a bibliography are provided. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EU1845513

DATE August 1978 NO. 134

University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science

US ISSN 0073-5310

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION IN SELECTED AMERICAN COLLEGES

by

STUART WAYNE MILLER

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
University of Illinois Graduate School of Library
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT. 1
PREFACE 2
THE DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION. 2
CURRENT PROGRAMS. 8
PATTERNS AND PROBLEMS 30
REFERENCES. 32
BIBLIOGRAPHY. 41
VITA. 47

IR000114

ABSTRACT

The concept of library use instruction has attracted a great deal of interest in the last several years. This paper briefly describes the development of this concept and discusses current programs of library use instruction in 13 American colleges. Course-related instruction appears to be the favored method for teaching library skills, but there appears to be no consensus among librarians on the general principles of library use instruction. These programs have, in many cases, required additional professional staff and better faculty/librarian communication. The lack of adequate evaluation of these programs is a serious problem.

PREFACE

The scope of this paper is limited to programs aimed at undergraduate students in American college libraries. To avoid repetition, the words "American," "college" and "undergraduate," when referring to colleges, libraries and students, have been omitted. A college may be contained in a larger university and its students may have access to a "university" library rather than a special one of their own.

A library use instruction program is defined as a procedure whereby students are taught to use library devices such as the card catalog; bibliographical tools, such as periodical indexes, subject reference sources, etc.; and to utilize effective search strategies in the library. While such programs may include the more traditional services, e.g., tours, reference services, provision of study guides and handbooks, the programs under discussion in this paper are distinguished as being active, i.e., the librarians involved do not expect the library and its resources to be utilized effectively or extensively by providing only these traditional, more "passive" services. Rather, library use instruction implies that librarians approach students and faculty in order to increase library use and ensure more effective library use.

I would like to thank all the librarians who responded to requests for information about their programs; this paper would not have been possible without their cooperation. Their expressions of encouragement for this project are greatly appreciated. I am also grateful for the constructive criticism and encouragement of Herman H. Fussler and Patricia Swanson; their help has been invaluable.

The data for the section "Current Programs" were collected in November-December 1975; some of these programs have undoubtedly undergone significant changes since that time.

This paper was originally prepared as a master's thesis for the Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, and appears here in a revised form.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION

Library use instruction is a relatively new term for an old concept. It can be applied to a wide variety of activities planned and/or implemented by librarians to encourage student use of libraries and/or to promote the more effective use of libraries. The corollary assumptions of these activities are: (1) students do not use the library as often as they should; and (2) when students use the library, they are not utilizing it as efficiently as they might.

One of the earliest responses to the problem of inefficient use was the introduction of reference services in academic libraries in the late 1880s. As these services developed, the traditional role of the reference librarian became that of assisting those students who requested help. In doing so, the reference librarian tried to give aid so that the student "could proceed better the next time on his own."[1]

There is an implicit educational role for the librarian in this situation, however passive. The tedium of answering the same questions repeatedly probably led to the development of several orientation programs aimed at acquainting the newly-arrived undergraduate with some of the basics of library use. The library tour was--and is--the most common method. Usually given in the first week of the term, these tours are designed not only to familiarize students with the physical plan of a library building, but have also been used to give some instruction in using the card catalog, periodical indexes, etc.

Separate courses in bibliographic instruction were developed in the twentieth century to give a more in-depth treatment of library sources. These were usually elective and are still very popular. Most libraries also developed handbooks and study guides for students on general library use and specific source materials. More recently, point-of-use instruction by computers, teaching machines and programmed texts have been developed to aid students in their use of the library.

Probably one of the most prevalent approaches to library use instruction was the "library lecture" to freshman English classes. This was an attempt to explain to all students at an early stage in their academic career the basics of library use. It is still common practice in many colleges. Many of the above methods were used in combination, presumably with the hope that all students would receive some kind of instruction in library use.

Dissatisfaction with these methods has increased over the years. Barbara Phipps's 1965 survey of 157 colleges revealed that 81% had some type of library use instruction (tours and the above-mentioned library lectures being most common), but that librarians involved in these activities shared the almost unanimous belief that not enough was being done.[2] Phipps also found that: (1) some form of library instruction was more common than it had been 20 years before; (2) staffing was considered insufficient to cope with large numbers of students; (3) librarians felt an acute need to give such instruction; and (4) little cooperation existed among the library, faculty, and college administration on the question of library use instruction.[3] As late as 1971, a survey of user instruction in New York revealed widespread dissatisfaction with what was being done.[4]

To add to this gloomy picture, surveys and studies of students' library skills generally confirmed librarians' suspicions that students do not know how to use the library effectively. As early as 1931, Loutitt and Patrick's testing of student library skills at Indiana University showed that, contrary to their expectations, knowledge of the library did not increase over time, i.e., there was no significant rise in library skills from freshman to senior levels.[5] Other surveys and more recent studies have simply reemphasized users' inadequacies.[6] It has become increasingly obvious that the tours, lectures, etc., have failed to give adequate instruction in library use. It is not surprising that Phipps found such widespread dissatisfaction with the status quo.[7]

This discontent has led to a new approach to library use instruction based on the belief that such instruction will never be effective unless a need for it is clearly perceived by both students and faculty. The assumption here is that the traditional forms of library use instruction (more appropriately termed orientation) are conducted in a vacuum; students have no perceived need for it during their orientation week. More importantly, unless faculty expect students to use the library, there will be no need to give library use instruction. Studies of library nonuse have been important in the formulation of new approaches to library use instruction.

In 1940, Harvie Branscomb authored a study of college libraries; he concluded that many students did not use the library because "in a great deal of their work they do not have to; they can do quite acceptable work, in some cases probably better work, without doing so."[8] He blamed administrators, instructors and librarians alike for the concept that the library is a "depository of knowledge."[9] Branscomb felt that this was at best a bad situation, and suggested many ways in which to solve it. He advocated better communication between faculty and librarians, more independent study for students, better education of librarians, etc. Branscomb firmly believed that the library ought to be better utilized and more involved in the educational process of its institution. However, he did not suggest any definite program of action, mainly because the individual nature and peculiar characteristics of each college precluded any general solution. Branscomb described some colleges that had placed an emphasis on independent study, which required a much greater use of books. On the average, such college libraries revealed a significant increase in circulation, if not in actual use.[10]

Branscomb believed that the structure of coursework influenced library use. In a more detailed study done in 1954 at Knox College, Patricia Knapp carried Branscomb's work a step further. By analyzing students' borrowing patterns in relation to the courses being taken, Knapp found that the library functioned in three ways: (1) it supplied copies of titles that students were required to read; (2) it supplied copies of titles on instructors' reading lists; and (3) it provided the "organization which made it possible for the students to select and locate all kinds of graphic materials relevant to a given topic or problem."[11] Taking the third function as the true or highest one, Knapp's analysis of borrowing patterns indicated that the library functioned on this level for a very small minority of students who were in courses that tended to be "small, advanced, and elective."[12] Knapp further concluded that these were the only courses for which the faculty expected the students to use the library on the highest level.

Knapp realized that the library could only function on this level if liberal arts education was "defined to emphasize the development of problem-solving skills, the ability to bring resources to bear upon the solution of problems."[13] Even if instructors were to define a liberal arts education in this way, however, they: "do not think of the library as an instrument to be used in the solution of problems. They think of it as a place to get books."[14] The implication was clear: "If we wish the library to function more effectively in the college, however we define effectiveness, we must direct our efforts toward the curriculum, working through the faculty."[15]

While neither Branscomb nor Knapp directly addressed themselves to library use instruction in their studies, these studies clearly have important implications. Both studies stated that the structure of coursework influenced library use; students would not use the library unless required to do so by their instructors. Knapp further suggested that even when instructors did require library use, they often required only a very low level of use, i.e., checking out reserve books. Consequently, if there is no perceived need to use the library, library use instruction may be a waste of time. However, if librarians believe that good library skills and efficient search strategies are useful in promoting the acquisition of problem-solving skills, then they cannot ignore the need for library use instruction. The traditional methods, such as tours and "library lectures," were failing to have any significant impact on either students or faculty members. The problem became one of changing the role of the library from that of a warehouse to that of

an active educational component of an institution. With this in mind, librarians began to explore ways to give library use instruction so that it could be seen as an integral part of any student's liberal arts education.

Experimentation along these lines had begun even before Branscomb's study. In the early 1930s Stephens College had done some experimentation when a librarian became the academic dean.[16] The "library-college" idea (discussed below) also developed in the 1930s. In 1949, librarians at Skidmore College decided to drop their separate course in bibliography and concentrate instead on giving instruction in the use of subject resource material to classes where there was an immediate, clear, and presumably perceived need for such instruction.[17] However, not much progress was made. In 1958, Joseph Whitten conducted a study of the relationships between college instruction and libraries in 72 liberal arts colleges. He found the librarians had not been able to integrate their services with the educational programs of their institutions. Whitten concluded that librarians ought to teach some kind of library use instruction (to be developed by both faculty and librarians), and that the burden of initiating such programs would rest on the librarians.[18]

Perhaps one of the most important attempts to demonstrate the need for acquiring library skills and to develop newer methods for teaching such skills was the Monteith College Library Project begun in 1959. The experiment at Monteith has been so widely discussed[19] that it will not be dealt with at any length here. However, as it has become something of a model for librarians today, a brief outline is required. Patricia Knapp, chief developer of the project, firmly believed that all students should be taught to use the library as a means of learning problem-solving skills applicable to all subjects. This conclusion was a result of her study of Knox College. She also believed that; "Competence in library use, like competence in reading, is clearly not a skill to be acquired once and for all at any one given level in any one given course. It is, rather, a complex of knowledge, skills, and attitudes which must be developed over a period of time through repeated and varied experiences in the use of library resources."[20] Library instruction at Monteith was thus not given by a tour or by one lecture; rather it was given as part of the required coursework, and was sequential in nature. The project:

> was designed to provide the student with an ever increasing measure of independence in his use of library resources at the same time that it demanded of him increasingly sophisticated performance in his use of the bibliographic organization....In developing the sequence we tried very hard to plan every assignment in such a way that it contributed to the students' understanding, not of specific tools and procedures, but of underlying principles of library and bibliographic organization.[21]

The Monteith experiment tried to give library use instruction in the context of a course, at a time when it was needed and aimed at all levels. (This idea achieves a perhaps more developed expression in the program at Earlham College.[22]) Originally, the teaching faculty at Monteith was responsible for library use instruction, but this responsibility was soon assumed by the librarians involved in the project since they were more motivated and better qualified to do so. However, the project was never accepted into the curriculum at Monteith for a variety of reasons. It was very time-consuming for all concerned, but perhaps most importantly, the

librarians never became part of the "teaching team."[23] Knapp had anticipated that one of the biggest obstacles for implementation of a sequential, course-related program of library use instruction would be a faculty that was "content-oriented" rather than "method-oriented."[24] This remains a key issue today.

The ideas behind the Monteith project generated numerous experiments by librarians. The course-related, sequential method of library use instruction currently enjoys a great deal of popularity. It solves the problem of traditional orientation--library skills are not taught in a vacuum--and allows the library an opportunity to become a more effective force in the educational process. For some, it is a way of defining the library's true function on the college campus.

There are, however, several problems with this approach. First, librarians themselves have not agreed that a sequential course-related program is the best method. There is still considerable interest in the separate course in library use, of which the program at Berkeley is a good example.[25] However, perhaps the most effective argument against separate courses is that they reach very few students (1%-5%), as the course is usually elective and enrollment often restricted.[26] Phipps's survey of 1965 also indicated that the separate course was satisfactory for "lower classmen."[27] It is not clear how relevant separate courses can be for advanced students working in their major fields.

Secondly, even if librarians no longer consider their libraries to be warehouses and are convinced that course-related library use instruction is necessary to achieve the goals of a liberal arts education, there is no guarantee that faculty members will accept this view. Securing faculty acceptance and cooperation is as much a problem now as it was in 1960 at Monteith. Librarians may not be helping the situation when they express the belief that teaching how to use the library is not in itself intrinsically interesting, but simply a means to an end. Librarians also are faced with the problem that even those faculty members who do expect their students to utilize library resources also expect the students already to know how to use the library.[28] It is a well-established fact that the instructor's attitude is the dominant factor in determining library use. This gives indirect but strong support to the concept of course-related instruction;[29] librarians cannot afford to ignore this evidence, and many current programs show an awareness of this fact. It is obvious, though, that communication with faculty has been and continues to be a major problem for librarians. For example, a survey of faculty attitudes toward and awareness of reference services at six California colleges indicated that, on the average, faculty members were aware of only 50% of the services available to them. The author of the survey analyses concluded that the burden of responsibility for developing better communication rests with the librarians.[30]

A third problem is the large number of students compared to the relatively small number of librarians. In 1976, the ratio of academic librarians to students in American colleges was 1:485.[31] However, if Palmer is correct in assuming that only one-third of academic librarians are directly involved in user services,[32] the ratio of librarians to students is closer to 1:1455. This figure may explain the interest in point-of-use instruction (by computers, slide/tape programs, audio cassette self-guided tours, etc.) and programmed instruction. Some of these methods have been shown to be as effective as the traditional lecture-demonstration.[33] However, one study has shown that a self-paced audiovisual method, followed by a

question and answer period with a librarian, was the most successful method for giving library use instruction, compared to similar methods of instruction without any contact with a librarian.[34] Point-of-use instruction and programmed courses may also run the risk of simply being a more elaborate and more expensive version of the traditional "passive" methods of library use instruction. Unless these devices are used and are flexible enough to give the student immediate aid, they would not appear to be very attractive alternatives to "live" instruction. Some have also suggested that students may be reluctant to show their ignorance by going to point-of-use devices which are openly displayed. Librarians at Northern Illinois University found that students showed almost no interest in using the various media productions offered on library use instruction.[35] Programmed instruction can be tailored to individual courses, but there are few commercially available programs; it is fairly time-consuming and expensive for individual libraries to develop their own.[36] It is not certain that such methods can substitute for the librarian, but adequate staffing is clearly a problem.

A fourth problem with course-related instruction is that few librarians have been trained to teach, although this may be applicable to regular faculty members as well. Course-related instruction involves the librarian in extensive classroom contacts, and some librarians feel that faculty status would give them a more official and secure position. However, faculty status by itself would not seem to be as important to the success of a program as close contact with the faculty. Whether faculty status for librarians assures closer faculty contacts remains to be seen.[37] A more general problem is that few library schools give any attention at all to user instruction; it has been suggested that this should be a part of every library school curriculum.[38]

A serious flaw with all the methods of user education is that there has been little evaluation. Even the relationship between academic achievement and user instruction has not been clearly established. Even though two studies have revealed a positive relationship between a student's ability to use the library and the student's grade point average, there has been little followup to these studies:[39] "There is a priority need for longitudinal [long-term] studies that trace the impact of user education programs on subsequent academic achievement and selected occupational variables."[40]

The concepts of library use instruction discussed above have developed from a concern about nonuse and a desire for a more problem-solving orientation to education. A related concept that also addresses this question is the idea of the "library-college." Originally articulated by Louis Shores in 1934, the "library-college" is conceived as an institution of learning (originally on the college level, but now extended to all levels) where there is no distinction between the classroom and the library, or the instructor and the librarian. These four elements merge; students are taught by a "bibliographically expert" faculty who monitor their students as they pursue independent studies in all subjects, utilizing all the sources of information available to them: books, films, field trips, work, records, etc. This is the concept of the "generic book," i.e., anything that serves as information useful to a student studying any given topic. The "library-college" thus consists of a library-classroom equipped with numerous information retrieval devices that allow the student to take advantage of all possible sources of information on his own under the guidance of the instructor-librarian.[41]

A "library-college" has never been fully developed, and the concept itself has been dismissed by many educators and librarians as impractical, expensive, nonspecific, and totally unrealistic. Yet it must be stated that this concept has helped to develop an awareness of the library's potential as an educational partner in the college, although the strident tones and messianic zeal of its supporters have perhaps done more harm than good. (It is no coincidence that a recent study of the "library-college" movement called its chief proponents "patriarchs."[42]) Programs of course-related instruction do tend to blur the distinction between "instructors" and "librarians"; however, it is clear that most programs still see a definite though related role for each.

The following section of this paper describes and analyzes 13 current programs of library use instruction in American colleges. Most of them seem to have developed (perhaps unintentionally) from the ideas behind the Monteith experiment, but some include separate courses, programmed instruction, etc. These programs have been chosen for their intrinsic interest and because most of them have not yet been dealt with in detail in the literature. Although many of them share similar goals, they all approach problems in different ways, illustrating not only the variety and uniqueness of American colleges, but also the lack of generally agreed-upon principles of library use instruction.

CURRENT PROGRAMS

Brown University

The program at Brown University (described in Educating the Library User[43]) has a very different approach to library use instruction than the other programs covered here. The Brown program is basically a passive one; still, it is worthwhile to consider, as it makes extensive use of student reference assistants, a component of many current programs.

Reference librarians at Brown recognized in the 1960s that their library had an extremely large collection (over 2 million volumes) and a community that was primarily composed of undergraduates. New library facilities and an increased trend toward independent study led the librarians to assume that very few undergraduates would really have the expertise to use this unusually large undergraduate library effectively. They decided to develop a program which employed undergraduate students as reference assistants:

> Not only could these students serve at reference desks during extended hours, but they might be available for special service to other undergraduates during regular hours. It was thought that the undergraduates might be less hesitant to approach one of their peers than to ask for help from an older librarian.[44]

Four students were hired in 1969 to work for one year. In addition to manning the reference desk, they were also to compile bibliographies on subjects in their major field. The program met with little success, however. The organizer of the project reported that "what the student trainees might have gained in approachability was more than compensated for by the broader library experience of the

the professional reference librarians.'"[45] It was also found that the students' bibliographic compilations were not superior to those done by professional librarians.[46]

Given these rather disappointing results, it is somewhat surprising that the librarians at Brown tried again with basically the same plan, except that graduate students were recruited as reference assistants. As in the first program, the goal was to provide better reference services to undergraduates. Presumably, graduate assistants had "approachability" but more subject expertise in their area of concentration than undergraduate students. A grant was obtained through the Council on Library Resources (CLR)-National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) College Library Program for a 5-year period to offer assistantships in the library for graduate students. Applicants were nominated by the academic departments and were chosen after extensive interviewing. (Few students in the natural sciences applied for the program, apparently because there was more money available elsewhere for graduate students in these areas.) The program began in 1970.

Student assistants attend a 2-month summer training session before the beginning of the academic year. The session is a fairly intensive program of introduction to reference sources, supervised duty at the reference desk, etc. Trainees also compile bibliographies and work on bibliographic assignments for the Dictionary of American Biography (which is edited at Brown). During their year of work, the graduate assistants spent 9 hours a week on the reference desk and 6 hours a week doing liaison work between their departments and the library by checking the subject collections, assisting in collection development, etc. The compilation of an introductory bibliography in their field for use by undergraduates was a major task of each reference assistant. By 1975, over 20,000 copies of some 24 guides had been compiled and printed.

The stated goal of the Brown program was to improve the quality of reference service for undergraduates.[47] It is not clear how the introduction of graduate reference assistants was actually supposed to improve quality, and the only evaluation reported for the program does not deal with the question. In each year of the program, a selected sample of undergraduates (10%) was asked to complete a questionnaire. The response rate was high each year (83%-90%). The questionnaire asked if the student was aware of the graduate assistants' services, did the student use them, etc. Nothing was asked about the quality of such services if they were used.[48] Analysis of the responses showed that "students using the services of graduate reference assistants are likely to be those who spend more time in the library and who also seek help from the professional reference librarians."[49] The program appears to have benefited those students who were already using the library.

It is not clear why Brown considers this to be a library use instruction program. The use of graduate reference assistants did not encourage student use nor did it teach any library skills. In planning the program, it apparently did not occur to the librarians at Brown that before the quality of reference service could be improved, students had to be utilizing library services.

> Those seeking a steady rise in use as the program matures and becomes publicized through an increasing variety of media have thus far failed to find it. Planners and evaluators of the undertaking must constantly bear in mind that they are dealing with informal library instruction, initiated by the student. Motivation of the student is critical. In the end, it is the student who must seek out the graduate assistant at an appropriate time.[50]

This is then, simply an example of an extension of traditional library services--help is given when asked.

Many other current library use instruction programs are utilizing students as reference assistants with the expectation that this will encourage student use. The Brown experiment suggests that this is an ill-founded belief and should be seriously questioned as a component of any program.

There may, however, be other effects of this program. The library experience may be extremely worthwhile to the individual student assistants. The Brown librarians also point out that the "long-term effects of 52 [the total number of graduate assistants in the first five years of the program] library-minded young scholars set loose in other academic settings may be considerable."[51] It would be interesting to follow those assistants who become college professors to see what emphasis they place in their courses on library skills and use. This would be a useful (albeit difficult) survey that might have some implications for library use instruction. It is doubtful, though, that Brown's approach will satisfy the librarian who seeks a more active role for the library in the immediate future. The results of Brown's program may be long-term and indirect, but this system does little to solve the immediate problems of nonuse and misuse.

Washington and Lee University

The program at this institution was developed by the university librarian and the faculty library committee. Funded by a grant from the CLR-NEH Program, the project's basic purpose "is to bring about a more effective and efficient use of the University's library system and its resources by college students and their professors."[52] The program began in 1971 and funding will end in 1976. It is not yet clear what the future status of the program will be after outside funding terminates.

There are two parts to this program. First, bibliographic instruction is offered to students in a variety of ways. A course has been developed (Bibliographical Resources) which is offered to sophomores and upperclass students during a 6-week spring term that is devoted to independent study campuswide. The first part of the course is taught by librarians; this consists of an introduction to basic reference tools and general bibliographical aids. Bibliographic form is also presented. The second part of the course is taught by cooperating faculty members. This consists of an introduction to subject reference tools in various areas; different subjects are offered each year in this second part. In four years, sections have been taught on art, economics, English, French, German, Spanish, history and politics. (The sciences are notably lacking; the program was designed to start with only the social sciences and the humanities although no reason is given for limiting the program's scope to only 2 disciplines. Some science professors have participated in parts of the program.[53]) Librarians and regular faculty are present at all sessions; the course grade is given by both librarians and faculty. In a 4-year period, 3 librarians and 11 faculty members have participated in teaching this course.

In addition, librarians are available on request to give bibliographic instruction to other classes. Also, 2 regular faculty members a year (on a voluntary basis) become "liaison professors"; they are partially relieved of regular teaching loads

in order to teach "an intensive research course in [their] field that will provide students with an intensive and comprehensive exposure to bibliographic research methods, tools, and techniques."[54] Librarians may assist these professors, and the liaison professors also work in their respective areas on collection development and bibliographies.

The second part of the program is the training and work of student assistants in the library.

> Drawn from majors in the pilot disciplines (social sciences and humanities), these students will serve as apprentice librarians during their junior years, becoming as knowledgeable in library reference procedures as feasible. Then, as seniors, they will play a primary role in guiding other students into a more efficient, productive use of the library's resources. Also, the student assistants will assist the library staff and departmental faculty in evaluating and strengthening the library's holdings in their subject area.[55]

Directed by librarians, these students spend the junior year working in various departments of the library assigned to various tasks in order to become acquainted with the overall structure and functions of the library. As seniors, they work about 6 hours a week at the reference desk and about 3 hours a week in assisting the liaison professors. The rationale for using these students is that "this type of assistance from senior students is expected to help overcome the reluctance, embarrassment, or other unwillingness on the part of many students to seek available help in using library resources."[56]

Coordination and analysis of the program is handled by the "reference coordinator," a regular faculty member who spends one-half of his time working with the program. He is responsible to the university librarian.

This program is scheduled to end in June 1976. There has been no formal evaluation of the program yet, but the 4 interim reports have revealed some interesting points. There has been a marked increase in reference activity. Between 1971-72 and 1972-73 (the first 2 years of the program), the total number of reference questions increased from 3335 to 4143. Perhaps more significantly, "in-depth" questions in 1970-71 (the year before the program began) totaled 294; in 1971-72 this increased to 1184; and in 1972-73 to 1929. (An "in-depth" question is not defined by the developers of this program.) It would be imprudent to claim that the library use instruction program was solely responsible for this rise in use, but the program developers feel that the increase is strongly related to it. It should be pointed out that the library program was developed partly in response to curricular reforms which placed a greater emphasis on independent study.[57] Given the facts that the course has never had more than 11 or 12 students at any one time, that only 2 liaison professors a year have taught upper-level bibliographic courses, and that all students are required to participate in independent work, one must be careful in assigning too much credit to the library program itself for increasing use. However, an analysis of circulation statistics showed "that the students of those professors who place an emphasis on bibliographic ability use the library extensively."[58] This is also supported by an analysis of the reference questions asked.

There has apparently been no student evaluation of the program, except that all of the student assistants have reported favorably on the personal value of their work. The course has been successful enough to warrant consideration of its being offered more than once a year in order to include more subject sections.[59]

Participating faculty members have not been formally surveyed to obtain reactions, but the program has favorably impressed those involved: "Several professors expressed the opinion that the quality of academic excellence achieved by their students improved considerably with this approach. In turn, the subject faculty is also finding the new additions to the library's collection helpful."[60] However, as the reference coordinator of the program states:

> The basic problem lies in the implementation of the program. While a characteristic response to my explanations of the aims of the program has been "I think this is a great idea," a characteristic response to my question about participating in it has been "Well, I don't think we can this year, but maybe next year or the year after. If we can, we'd just like to keep a foot in the door." In essence, then, I have been confronted by the dichotomy between theoretical enthusiasm on the one hand and a sense of practical difficulties on the other.[61]

The philosophy behind this program seems to be that librarians believe the most effective way to teach efficient library use is through the regular teaching faculty, although librarians are qualified to teach the more general information. However, the belief that the regular faculty can give adequate library instruction has been questioned elsewhere.[62]

This program obviously reaches a very few students, although it must be remembered that this is still an experimental program. Also it is not established which reference sources will be covered in the subject sections of Bibliographic Resources and which will be covered in the bibliographic sections taught by the liaison professors. This problem must already be apparent and should not be overlooked, particularly if the program is to be expanded. There is also a heavy emphasis on upperclass students; freshmen are apparently not allowed to enroll in the course. Beginning students undoubtedly have special problems in dealing with a college library for the first time, and their needs should be satisfied.

The use of student assistants is valuable to the liaison professors and beneficial to the assistants themselves. However, the notion that students are more approachable than professional reference librarians has never been clearly demonstrated. Indeed, the Brown program would suggest that student assistants are used only by students who use the services of professional librarians anyway. There appears to be no attempt at Washington and Lee to investigate this question.

This program seems to have met with some success, even though there has been inadequate evaluation. Many faculty members seem to be adopting a "wait and see" attitude before cooperating; the crucial test will be the college's decision whether or not to continue the program. Considering the fact that the library was able to increase its budget from $97,195 in 1966-67 to $251,688 in 1969-70 and more than double its book budget in the same period in anticipation of the demand to be created by the new curriculum,[63] the library appears to have enough support to ensure the continuation of its attempt at library use instruction.

Manhattanville College

The Manhattanville library use instruction program is implemented through required freshman preceptorials in various subject areas. (These were initiated during a curricular reform in the early 1970s.) Class time in each preceptorial is allotted to librarians who provide: "basic library instruction related to the specific course of study of the preceptorial. Basic research techniques and an introduction to the principles of bibliography are thus provided for each Freshman."[64]

This instruction is apparently the result of a long tradition of library involvement in the educational process at Manhattanville. Librarians already held faculty status when they were invited to develop the program. The director of the library states: "I believe it is fair to say that the idea, at least, of formal library instruction has been totally accepted by the faculty here."[65]

In addition, a 5-year grant was obtained in 1974 from the CLR-NEH Program to start a student internship program. The objective of this program is:

> to strengthen Library Instruction by the direct participation of superior students. After a period of formal training in problem identification and method of inquiry, the interns take part in the formal presentations on the use of the library. As students who assist in the Reference Department on a regularly-scheduled basis, they continue to help their peers on a continuing basis under the direction of the reference librarians.[66]

There has been no attempt to evaluate the effects on student library use of either the instructional program or the student internship program. Presumably, since the instructional program is now an established part of the curriculum, no evaluation is considered necessary. It also appears that the student internship program is viewed as a means of providing experience for the interns and assistance for the reference librarians. "The limitations of student interns in reference work are obvious, but most are able to supply directional assistance of some kind and to assist in the preparation of bibliographies."[67]

This program appears to be based on the belief that students are best taught library skills and search strategies at the freshman level. It does not seem to allow for the more specialized needs of upperclassmen as they begin their subject concentrations. Exclusive concentration on freshmen has been criticized as suggesting to students that one introduction to library use will be sufficient to acquire good library skills.[68] However, if all freshmen are required to have library use instruction, the groundwork has already been laid. If early instruction is adequate, it gives the student at least an appreciation for the bibliographic structure provided by a library. Moreover, librarians are thus able to establish personal contacts with students, and as a result, students will possibly be less hesitant to ask librarians for assistance in the future. Making the student aware of the librarian's existence may be one of the most important results of library use instruction.

The use of student library assistants once again raises the question of the effectiveness of this method in encouraging library use among other students. The Manhattanville internship program will require evaluation, and it is to be hoped that the librarians will attempt to assess the "approachability" of student assistants

as opposed to that of professional reference librarians. This would be extremely useful. The Manhattanville plan seems to have been moderately successful, and to demonstrate a strong commitment to course-related instruction. It must be pointed out that such an approach is obviously the result of the institutional climate, i.e., a cooperative faculty.

Occidental College

This institution has approached the problem of library use instruction differently. Instead of first developing a program and then implementing it, the library obtained a 5-year CLR-NEH Program grant in order to assess the library needs of students and faculty, before beginning any kind of program.

In 1974 a "librarian at large" was hired and 3 faculty members were selected for 1 term each to work in the library as "faculty library consultants" on a half-time basis. These people were expected to help to stimulate library use:

> While there were few specific ideas how this might be accomplished, the thought seemed to be that these...people would work together and set up a dialogue between the library and the rest of the campus. To this end, they have devoted a great deal of time in just getting to know the students, faculty, and administration of the College. We hoped that by learning their needs, interests, and attitudes with respect to the library and its staff that we might get a better handle on what they need and not what they think they need. What we found in this process was that we frequently found ourselves acting as troubleshooters or apologists for the library and its operation.[69]

Some concrete activities were implemented during the first year of the program. The librarian-at-large conducted a fractional-credit course for freshmen on library resources in connection with a political science course--at the request of the class's professor. The class, designed specifically for freshmen as an introductory course in library research, attracted 140 students. It is being offered each term in 1975-76. A "Term Paper Clinic" was also conducted by the librarian-at-large, attracting over 500 students, most of whom gave it a favorable evaluation.[70]

Three faculty library consultants (1 instructor for 1 term each from the history, art and English departments) were available in offices in the library for consultation by students working in the respective areas. However, this service was not heavily patronized, presumably because of poor publicity.[71] These faculty consultants also spent a great deal of time visiting other faculty members to discuss library needs and library services, and compiled bibliographies for use in courses and in the library.

The developers of the program were reluctant to make any evaluations after only 1 year. However, a positive note emerged. The librarian-at-large stated: "A librarian can become an active part of the academic community and move freely among the various departments."[72] This remark will perhaps encourage librarians who are still hesitant to pursue a more active educational role in their institutions.

The program at Occidental to stimulate library use does, of course, emphasize actual library instruction; the librarian-at-large expects to teach more students in the second year of the program. It seems, however, that the key element in the Occidental program is public relations. Librarians apparently believe that the library must have high visibility on campus and that the librarians must actively raise this level of awareness among students and faculty.

The decision to start without a specific program is rather unusual--and perhaps the most practical. The use of library instruction to create a new role for the college library is a fairly radical departure from past practices, and it may be important to begin with only a commitment to an idea rather than an arranged program. The librarians at Occidental foresee that the program: "will be cumulative...and that it will take several more years of continued, intensive efforts to work with students and faculty alike toward a better understanding of the library and how its collections, and staff, can serve to fullest capacity the academic objectives of the College."[73]

Dillard University

The goal of the library use instruction program at Dillard was "to integrate more fully the library and library instruction into the Social Sciences and the Humanities curriculum of the university."[74] The stated objectives were: (1) to introduce students to basic reference sources, (2) to assist them in locating information and in becoming more expert in locating sources, and (3) to provide bibliographical assistance to the faculty. A 5-year grant was obtained from the CLR-NEH Program for the development of such a program.

The program began in 1971 with a total of 470 freshmen and 18 faculty members teaching course sequences required of all freshmen. Two librarians met once a week with groups of about 20 students each to give library use instruction. Planning for these sessions was done cooperatively by librarians and the faculty involved. Individual sessions with the librarians could also be scheduled by students seeking special help. Planning for library instruction considered course content, but the assignments were designed for learning about the card catalog, classification schemes, subject headings, etc. Librarians also gave sessions on term paper preparation and developed a filmstrip on the subject.

The library sessions were not repeated in the second semester of 1972, partly because the librarians wanted to see which faculty members would continue to ask for assistance, and partly because students from the first semester felt that the course should not be continued (although 67% of the students rated the sessions useful).[75]

This program was repeated in 1972-73 but was discontinued the next year; it was felt that the library sessions were not believed to be working as well as they should, probably because of the difficulty in securing effective faculty cooperation. There was also a problem with staffing: the 2 librarians involved in the program were still responsible for all their other duties; the plan to hire an additional librarian to work full-time on the program was never implemented. A change in curriculum also eliminated the course structure as it existed when the program began. However, all freshmen are still required to take a unit on the library taught by librarians. The librarians also continued to offer their services for bibliographic instruction on an individual basis.

It is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of this program; however, it appears that the students were receptive to library use instruction. Questionnaires were given to students after the library sessions; in 1971-72, 92% of those responding "felt that the [program] helped with term papers and class work."[76] Of those responding in 1972-73, 53% felt that the library instruction had been beneficial.[77]

The major obstacle in the program seems to have been a lack of faculty cooperation. The librarians often felt that the instructors needed more convincing than the students. "Once they [the students] are convinced, the instructional portion for the library works like a charm on the students."[78] It is only fair to point out that the program was planned (and a grant obtained for it) without any faculty input; this was undoubtedly an egregious error on the librarians' part.[79] The librarians in the end had to insist that instructors come to their classes' library sessions.[80] The lack of communication between the librarians and the faculty was eventually viewed by the former as a serious weakness.[81] However, it is difficult to sympathize with the librarians' problems in this respect.

Despite the initial difficulties, it appears that the faculty who worked with the program were convinced of its usefulness: "They noticed the students' increased proficiency in participation in classroom discussions and in the writing of term papers."[82] The librarians also benefited from the contacts made possible by the program:

> Librarians have become more of a partner in the education of students. There were times in which librarians were not called on to participate on university committees in working out university problems. As a result of the interpersonal relationships with faculty, participant librarians are being called upon to provide information for university endeavors and provide leadership on committees. More open discussions on curriculum development and classroom activities have included library materials.[83]

This statement, coupled with the librarians' failure to consult with faculty before the program began, suggests that there was more than simply a desire to give students bibliographic instruction. Perhaps the planners hoped that development of a library instruction program would greatly improve the librarians' status on campus. Though this has apparently resulted, the program suffered from the librarians' initial failure to plan with the faculty.

This program also illustrates that a lack of personnel is a serious problem. Any program of this type requires at least one librarian with full-time responsibilities for library use instruction.

Perhaps the most positive result of this program is that students and faculty have a heightened awareness of the library. As one of the librarians said, "We are much more appreciated by our faculty now than before the project began and our students are definitely more likely to approach us with problems in their classes than before."[84] A more concrete evaluation of the effects of the program has not been undertaken, a fact greatly to be regretted. The program has managed to maintain itself after the end of special funding, so it may be judged as at least partially successful.

Dickinson College

The library use instruction program in this institution is unique. Seven professional librarians constitute the faculty for the Department of Library Resources, i.e., the library. These faculty-librarians function as "subject specialists or departmental liaison with academic departments with the sole purpose of aiding professors and classes in the use of the library, developing bibliographies and collection development."[85] To implement these aims, the librarians give instruction to various classes on special materials in the library and also offer a full-credit course called Library Science 201. Limited to 30 students, this course is offered each semester, and is open to all but first-semester freshmen: "Formal instruction is given in the organization and the use of the card catalog, introduction to periodical indexes and concentrated work in book selection, bibliographies, biographies, subject area reference resources, and research in using Special Collections and manuscripts."[86] Students may also take an independent bibliography course with any of the librarians on a topic in the student's field of concentration.

This program has been in existence for about 3 years. A possible drawback is the lack of course-related instruction; furthermore, 30 students a semester is a small number out of a total enrollment of 1600. Even with invitational lectures given by librarians to individual classes, very few students are exposed to library use instruction. The favorable librarian/student ratio should seemingly allow for a more extensive program.

The formal course itself is similar to a course taught to library school students. There is thus a danger of giving too much detail and covering more ground than is necessary. For example, how many students really need to learn about the use of special collections and manuscripts?

It must be remembered that individual institutions vary sufficiently in their educational programs to preclude an "ideal" model of library use instruction. The approach of the librarians at Dickinson may be appropriate, but it would be useful to the librarians involved to attempt some kind of evaluation to measure their program's effectiveness. This has not yet been done. It would also be interesting to see whether the library's departmental status has actually changed the library's role in its institution. The above description would not seem to indicate this.

Oberlin College

Like many other institutions, the Oberlin College program in library use instruction was developed by the library staff and carried out in cooperation with volunteer faculty members. The program is centered around 4 "librarian information specialists" who establish:

> contacts with selected academic departments in order to determine course objectives and information needs, and to decide on ways in which the Learning Resources Center can most effectively provide such support. Methods used vary according to the content and goals of each particular course, the attitude of the classroom faculty member, and the types of information required.[87]

Such a program includes a variety of activities--producing specialized bibliographies, lecturing to classes, meeting with individual students, etc.

In 1973, a student liaison project was implemented. Students from appropriate departments were hired "to serve as contact persons between the Learning Resources Center and members of various academic departments. These student contacts perform a variety of duties--obtaining syllabi from professors for the librarians' use, finding and processing materials for the reserve section, arranging for classroom instruction by the librarians, etc."[88] Termed an "eclectic combination of elements,"[89] this program appears to be admirably suited to the individual needs of its constituency. There is no one fixed way in which library use instruction is implemented, allowing the program to be flexible enough to accommodate the unique needs of each professor and subject area.

Obviously, this program does not reach all students. Approximately 10% of the faculty and 20% of the student body is involved at any one time.[90] Interestingly enough, the most cooperative faculty members are the "newer and/or younger" members.[91] These instructors are also likely to be nontenured, meaning that the librarians must repeat their efforts with their replacements. "Reaching established faculty has proved much more difficult,"[92] although the situation seems to be improving.

The librarians at Oberlin have apparently recognized the possibility that library use instruction might create a heavy demand for materials that the library does not possess. Consequently, interlibrary loan was improved by telephoning for requests and paying for United Parcel Service delivery. A library school student in Cleveland was hired to locate materials and do photocopying; computerized data base searches were also provided.

It is perhaps significant that Oberlin has a much larger library budget than comparable institutions in the Great Lakes College Association (GLCA). Having more money should ensure greater flexibility; however, Earlham College (also a GLCA school) has a more highly developed program with a much smaller budget.

The flexibility of the Oberlin program is clearly its chief asset--the desirability of having different modes of instruction for different courses is obvious. The librarians are apparently aware that some kinds of courses are more appropriate for library instruction than others, a fact perhaps overlooked by many supporters of course-related instruction. Again, the most serious problem at Oberlin seems to be that of convincing the established faculty to participate.

State University College at Brockport/SUNY

The library use instruction program in this institution has two goals:

1. to provide learning situations at each educational level from pre-college to graduate which will enable students to develop the literature searching strategies appropriate to their academic pursuits; and

2. to open fully to faculty and students the resources of the library so that they will be used to support the academic programs of the college and to promote intellectual activity.[93]

Beginning in the spring semester of 1975, 200 freshmen enrolled in an English composition course were given a 2-week program of library use instruction. (The program is being continued with some modifications in 1975-76 with approximately 350 freshmen.) The program consists of 3 phases: (1) a self-guided tour of the library by audio cassette; (2) a "slide/sound presentation showing the steps to follow in locating materials for a term paper and including some explication of basic reference tools"; and (3) "a prepared set of worksheets which guide the student through the actual process of literature searching."[94] Librarians are available to assist during this portion of the program. The worksheets are graded by the librarians and become part of the course grade.

To provide for more specialized information needs, librarians conduct class sessions at the invitation of instructors on the bibliographic apparatus of a particular field. Minicourses for credit are also offered to upperclassmen; these cover the bibliographic structure of the humanities, the social sciences and the natural sciences. (As of November 1975, only the humanities minicourse had been implemented.) Librarians also offer more individualized instruction to students having difficulties in their studies; this is basically the same as the 3-part program for freshmen, but offers more personal contact with the librarians. In addition, the library program offers assistance for special categories of students, e.g., foreign students and the physically handicapped. Graduate students also receive bibliographic instruction in those courses where the instructor has invited a librarian to lecture.

The program has not required special funding, but the public services staff has increased from 4 to 12 as a result of the expanded services. All 12 participate in the program. This appears to support the belief of many librarians that such programs require more personnel.[95]

The use of multimedia in library instruction has been widely discussed in the literature and implemented in many institutions. One study indicated that the most effective way of using media is to couple it with an oral summary and a question and answer period with a librarian.[96] While this may not be completely followed at Brockport, there is an assignment to be prepared with librarians at hand (i.e., the worksheets). In 1975, students involved in the 3-phase program were given a pretest on library skills both before and after the 2-week program.[97] Results had not become available at the time material was solicited from Brockport.

The program appears to be well structured and has reached a number of students. In 1974-75, librarians taught 212 class sessions and faculty support appears to remain good.[98]

Swarthmore College

The program developed at this institution emerged from an extensive self-evaluation project undertaken by the college in 1966-67. A Special Committee on Library Policy was part of the project; from its studies and surveys, the committee concluded that the great majority of students at Swarthmore were graduating without an adequate knowledge of the library.

> [The] failure to teach the use of the library as part of a liberal education discourages the students' development of sophisticated intellectual lives toincidentgl with the broad range of their

> liberal studies. If the primary purpose of a liberal arts education is to teach students how to teach themselves--how to seek and answer, by scholarly means, questions of importance to themselves--then the neglect of library training in college diminishes his ability to maintain whatever liberal education is achieved there.[99]

Based on this belief, the committee recommended that "experience and proficiency in the use of library materials be made an integral part of courses of instruction."[100] The committee decided that neither the concept of the library as a warehouse nor the "library-college" would be appropriate for the achievement of these aims. A middle ground between these two extremes was posed: a "teaching library."

> The teaching library should be understood as having three main functions: 1) to assist the faculty in its teaching; 2) to teach students directly how to use the library; and 3) to serve students as they teach themselves. In each of these roles the library would demonstrate the relevance of its organization of learning to the disciplinary system, the utility and benefits of their interplay, in both teaching and learning. It would fulfill these roles by offering a rich and carefully-selected collection, bibliographically organized and physically deployed as to encourage either casual, leisurely exploration, or rigorous systematic research, under the unobtrusive guidance of a professional staff dedicated to teaching with books.[101]

The committee recommended that, in order to implement the concept of a "teaching library," 3 additional librarians be hired, each being responsible for one of the broad areas, i.e., of the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. These persons would assist the existing reference librarian, whose capabilities and services were recognized by the committee as being underutilized.[102] These new "divisional librarians" would be responsible for collection development in their area of expertise and also provide bibliographic assistance and instruction to faculty and students on an individual and group basis.

In 1972, under a 5-year grant from the CLR-NEH Program, the first stage of this program began with the hiring of a humanities librarian. In its recommendations the committee had suggested that librarians with advanced degrees in an academic subject would be the ideal choice for these positions. Swarthmore already had a science librarian with a doctorate, and the new humanities librarian was similarly qualified. (In 1975, the college hired, on its own, a social science librarian.)[106]

The first year of the program was devoted almost exclusively to the humanities librarian's attempt to define his role within the library and the college. Some concrete achievements were made: some faculty contacts were established, a monitoring system for acquisitions developed, and several gaps in the library collection identified and filled. Several class sessions on library use and bibliographic instruction were given at the request of faculty members. By the third year of the program, the humanities librarian had expanded his activities to include a noncredit course on reference sources offered each semester. Lectures to classes were continued and increased in number to include courses from almost all of the

departments in both the humanities and the social sciences. The humanities librarian also helped to initiate the first evening reference services in the library's history and was available to conduct individual bibliographic tutorials and provide assistance to individual students.

No evaluative mechanism has been developed for testing this program's effectiveness; however:

> Annual reports for 1974/75 from various public service departments...indicate an appreciable increase in requests for reference services, bibliographical lectures, interlibrary loan and the circulation of books and periodicals. All of this increased activity is acknowledged as in part being attributable to the heightened awareness of what the library has to offer through the continuing efforts of the Humanities librarian to implement the teaching library concept, and several faculty members have also indicated that the quality of students' papers, both in substance and documentation, has improved greatly.[103]

It is interesting to note that the Swarthmore program follows closely some of the ideas put forth by Knapp in conjunction with her study of library use patterns at Knox College. Her definition of the highest function of the library obviously complemented the notion of independent study, and the concept of the "teaching library" clearly implies the desirability of independent inquiry. It is apparent that the self-evaluation study of 1966-67 tended to recommend more flexibility in the curriculum and more opportunity for independent study.[104] The concept of the "teaching library" can be seen as an attempt to encourage this, as demonstrated by the work of the humanities librarian. Before the program began, the library had 2 reserve book sections totaling about 25,000 titles, an inordinately large number; this was primarily due to the prevailing mode of instruction among the faculty. Thus, many students were able to experience the library almost exclusively in "across-the-counter transactions."[105] This reliance on reserve reading for coursework was (and is) perceived to be the main obstacle in implementing the "teaching library" concept. Subsequently, in 1975, this reserve section was cut in half.[106]

The committee maintains that:

> The humanities librarian has had an impact on humanities education through the development of individual contacts with faculty and students. Some faculty members have redesigned their syllabi and relied upon the humanities librarian and the library's reference collection to provide their students with bibliographic orientation. In general, instructors who have taken advantage of this new library service have commented that it has benefited both their teaching and their own research. Many students have acknowledged that they have begun to learn to function independently in the library.[107]

It must be emphasized that the humanities librarian holds an advanced academic degree; as such, he may be on a more equal level with the faculty than the librarian without advanced academic training. The implication for the future may be that librarians would be wise to hold advanced degrees in a particular academic subject if they are interested in developing something similar to the "teaching library."

An obvious criticism of the program is that it reaches only a few students directly (apparently the noncredit course has attracted no more than 6 students each time it has been offered), and lecturing to individual classes may present problems of repetition. Still, the program has had some impact both on library use and instructional methods. At the very least, it has created a heightened sense of awareness of the library's potential in providing educational experiences for both students and faculty. This accomplishment is not to be belittled. Again, one wishes for more evaluation of the actual effect of this kind of program.

University of Richmond

The stated goals of the library program in this institution are to involve the library more in the education of undergraduates, and "to improve the partnership between faculty and library staff."[108] The program is based on the idea that library use instruction can best be integrated into the curriculum by familiarizing instructors with relevant library services. Close contacts thus developed between faculty members and librarians will then enable both groups to provide better instruction for undergraduates.

To fulfill these aims, up to 15 faculty members are chosen to participate in the program during the academic year. They are chosen by the collective decision of the university librarian, the Faculty Library Committee, the appropriate dean, and the university provost. These faculty members (initially from the humanities and social sciences) will be allowed to carry half the normal teaching load for a year in order to participate in the library program. During this released time, the selected faculty members, guided by librarians, will (1) develop library-centered teaching, (2) assist in reference services, (3) develop a program of instruction in use of the library, (4) plan and inaugurate a 10-year collection development program, and (5) investigate other ways to enhance the library's role in undergraduate education.[109] Such a program should provide participating faculty with more time for class preparation and encourages the presentation of library instruction in many courses.[110] The use of faculty members at the reference desk will supposedly "immediately benefit students, improve reference services, and encourage other faculty members not directly involved in the project to utilize the library more in their teaching."[111] The collection development portion of the program will presumably upgrade the library's collection and allow faculty members to become more aware of available materials.

In addition to assisting the faculty members in the program, librarians are expected to increase the numbers of lectures presented to individual classes. Slide/tape programs on the use of various kinds of library resources have been developed, and planning for self-paced programs on the use of the card catalog, etc., is now underway, in cooperation with the faculty. Term paper clinics to be taught by the librarians are also being planned.[112]

This program began in 1973-74 under a 5-year grant from the CLR-NEH Program. There has been no attempt yet to evaluate its effectiveness, but it is strongly supported by the library administration. The university librarian states that the program has had a "most positive" impact on both the librarians and the participating faculty; he anticipates institutional support for the program at the end of the grant. It is believed that the program "has (1) recognized the library and the faculty as partners in the learning process in a very substantial

and tangible method--time off from teaching for course development; (2) impressed the faculty and librarians with the importance of logical collection development."[113]

This program is somewhat unique in that it focuses on instructing the faculty directly rather than students, although the students are presumably the beneficiaries. Many other programs are indirectly aimed at faculty instruction, but nowhere has this been so extensively developed.

The program's success has yet to be determined, and it appears that there would be several problems with such an approach. First, it seems to place a considerable burden on the librarians. They not only train the faculty, but also have reference duties and must lecture to classes. Also it is not at all certain that the faculty are being used in the most efficient way. It is difficult to understand how they could give very effective reference service; they would presumably know very little about sources outside their own field. Perhaps their presence on the reference desk is a way of underlining the importance of library skills and illustrating to the faculty the extent of students' knowledge of the library. However, it would seem more useful to let them concentrate entirely on collection development and course preparation. The problem with this program is the difficulty of coordinating the library instruction given by so many professors. Too much repetition in the classroom is obviously detrimental--a problem which the developers of this program do not appear to have considered.

There has been little evaluation of this program so far and it is to be hoped that such an attempt will be made. The almost complete concentration on educating the faculty is a unique approach and certainly deserves a thorough evaluation as to its being an effective method of library use instruction.

Eastern Michigan University

Under a 5-year grant from the CLR-NEH Program, Eastern Michigan University (EMU) began a program of library use instruction for undergraduates in 1970. Entitled "Library Outreach Orientation Program," the project was implemented through the hiring of an "orientation librarian" and the creation of a Library Outreach Orientation Office within the library. Four objectives were formulated:

1. Assure every student at EMU the opportunity to understand basic library resources and their uses in the facilitation of his or her learning;

2. Explore methods for achieving the greatest understanding of basic library resources;

3. Assist the University's teaching faculty in understanding the contributions librarians are prepared to make to the student's learning and to encourage cooperative efforts to achieve this goal;

4. Demonstrate the role librarians can play in motivating students.[114]

To implement these objectives, the orientation librarians (originally 2 librarians; later only 1) decided to "concentrate their efforts on course-related and assignment-related library instruction."[115] Contacts were made with academic

deans and department chairmen to seek approval for cooperative ventures between the librarians and regular faculty. This identified individual courses (mostly introductory-level courses in the social sciences and the humanities) where library use instruction could be most effective. Contacts with individual instructors resulted in a large number of library sessions, conducted in a wide range of academic subjects, as a regular part of course work. Timing was considered crucial, so most library sessions were presented just before assignments were made requiring library use. Search strategies, basic reference tools, card catalogs, etc., were all discussed in the library sessions, most of which were attended by the instructors. In some cases, more than one class meeting was devoted to library use instruction and there was often a "working session" as well.

Instruction was reinforced by the distribution of study guides (eventually totalling 68) on various topics; these suggested basic sources and search techniques. Beginning in 1972, the orientation librarian also offered a 1-hour course in bibliographic instruction, an elective in the School of Education. In the 5-year period of the initial program, the orientation librarian presented 654 library sessions to 13,784 students and was also available for individual consultation.

During the course of the program an attempt was made to evaluate student reaction through questionnaires. The responses were generally favorable.[116] In addition, a random sample of 500 seniors selected at the end of the program in 1975 to give an evaluation yielded 116 replies. Of those responding, 54% had had library use instruction (most during freshman year); 35% of this group had received more than one session in library use. When these responses were compared with the 46% of the sample that had not had library use instruction, it was found that the students who did have library instruction used the library more frequently, perceived librarians as "helpers," and had "greater familiarity with reference sources in their major field of study."[117]

Participating faculty members were also asked to evaluate the program. Of 196 faculty participants in the 5-year period, 99 were still at EMU in 1975; 48% of them responded. Their overall response was positive: 98% wanted the program continued; 75% felt that "their students produce[d] papers with better documentation after library instruction"[118]; and 92% thought that "their students were more confident in using the library after a library session."[119]

Reference statistics kept over a 6-year period (beginning in 1969-70 before the program began) show an increase (though fluctuating somewhat) in questions of a "search" or "extended search" nature.[120] There seems to be a discernible increase over time, despite the fluctuations (which might be a result of uneven recording). The increase of in-depth questions strongly suggests that more students were utilizing reference services, indicating a heightened awareness of library services and possibly a better understanding of the complexities of information retrieval.

The basic weakness of the program is perceived to be the inability to obtain blanket approval for mandatory library use instruction in some courses. "Such requirements cannot be made because the freedom of teachers prevails. This meant that the orientation librarian had to work with each instructor to convince him or her about the importance of library instruction."[121] Also, since library

sessions were held in several introductory courses, there was some repetition, to which objection was made. However, it appears that this was not a serious problem.[122]

The program has been incorporated into the regular university budget so that it is now an ongoing program. This, if nothing else, rates it as a success.

Considering the large student body of EMU, it is interesting that this program did not use any media presentations or any form of programmed instruction (other than a slide/tape introduction to the library program made available to students at the beginning of each term). When students were asked how they would like to receive library use instruction, only 9% indicated a preference for slide/tape presentations, and 88% preferred the library sessions as they were taught or to go directly to a librarian.[123]

The developers of this program were careful to approach as many faculty members as possible, going first to the administrative faculty (deans and department heads). This may account for the general cooperation received in the initial stages of the program and for its continuing support. It is also significant that the orientation librarian's responsibilities were exclusively for library instruction. It is doubtful that the number of students reached in the first 5 years of the program would have been as numerous if there had not been one librarian with no other responsibilities.

The orientation librarian herself expressed the belief that everyone's full cooperation is absolutely essential and is the key ingredient for a successful program; "perseverance, diplomacy, creativity, and endless energy" on the part of librarians are also necessary characteristics.[124]

Wabash College

The program developed at Wabash College began in connection with a curricular innovation: a program of freshman seminars introduced in 1970-71. These were designed to provide some flexibility for freshmen in an otherwise fairly rigid curriculum in that the first 2 years of study are usually devoted to required courses. The seminars were also designed to give freshmen a chance to develop closer contacts with individual faculty members and to provide an opportunity for independent study at an early period in their 4 years of study. Originally electives, these seminars are now required of all freshmen, i.e., at least one must be taken during the freshman year. Several seminars are offered in a variety of subjects; each subject is of personal interest to the professor and is beyond the scope of the general curriculum.

The Faculty Library Committee was developing a program of library instruction at the same time, and it was decided to integrate the 2 programs. A 5-year grant was obtained from the Council on Library Resources for this purpose and the seminars began in the fall of 1970.[125]

The stated objective of the library program was to change the "concept of the library from that of a storehouse of information to that of a workshop for the liberal arts."[126] To do this, library use instruction was provided to students selected as assistants to help teach the freshman seminars. These students were juniors or seniors chosen by those faculty members teaching freshman seminars.

Student assistants participated in a workshop before the beginning of their seminars. Assistants were given an introduction to some basic reference sources and spent time with their directing instructors in planning the seminars. (This workshop was later dropped, and assistants were given weekly sessions on library use throughout the semester.) During the actual term, assistants were expected to help freshmen in their seminars with library-related problems; they also worked at the reference desk at night to offer expanded service hours.

This approach was very indirect. The program does not give instruction directly to students; rather, the student assistants are instructed in the hope they will pass on their knowledge to the students in their seminars: "If the program works right, some of the novices in the seminars of one semester will turn into the guides of the following semester. Over a period of several semesters we will create a pool of students who, through direct experience, will have learned to make the library work for them and who will influence their fellow students."[127] In the second year of the program, students were recruited as "in-house" assistants. They trained along with seminar assistants to be available in their living units to help any student with library-related problems.

A faculty member originally coordinated the program; when he returned to full-time teaching, the college librarian took over with the assistance of the reference librarian, who was responsible for giving instruction to the seminar and "in-house" assistants. The program necessitated the hiring of this reference librarian--the first in the library's history. By the time special funding ended in 1975, the seminars were required of all freshmen and the student assistant program was continued by the library.

It is debatable whether the original goal of changing the concept of the library from that of a warehouse to that of a liberal arts workshop has been achieved. Evaluation of student and faculty attitudes toward the program shows a wide range of attitudes. Faculty response has been very mixed. One of the obvious drawbacks to the program is that the faculty members may use their student assistants in any way they please, and there is no session in the freshman seminars on library use. However, most of the participating faculty "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that their student assistants were adequately trained in library resources and that having a student assistant was worthwhile. Out of 21 faculty respondents (from a participating faculty of 25), 15 "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that "most students would make better grades if they were more knowledgeable about how to use the library"[128]; this indicates that the participating faculty saw some value in the program.

Despite this, faculty reaction campuswide has been less than supportive. Some negative feelings about the library may still remain from a heated debate over faculty status for librarians in 1970-71; there was also controversy at a later date over a media program instituted by the library.[129] But there is a more deep-rooted cause. The college faculty as a whole: "are disinterested in applied or practical as opposed to theoretical course content. In this context, bibliographic instruction is thought to be void of substance (therefore not worthy of consideration), particularly when compared with discussion on Sophocles, Aquinas, or Darwin."[130] A library evaluation team from ALA also noted: "Wabash has a tradition which has not demanded a more service-oriented library and therefore better communication with the faculty will be necessary to establish stronger services."[131]

The most enthusiastic response to the program has come from participating students. All 445 students in the program were sent a questionnaire in early 1975 to evaluate the program. (It would perhaps have been better to have had an ongoing evaluation process. Some former students who were sent questionnaires had participated in the program in 1970 and were thus 5 years removed from it.) By April 1975, 225 responses had been received. Of these, 169 "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that "knowing how to use the library increases my chances of making good grades"; the same number "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that the student assistant program should be continued.[132] Interestingly enough, the ALA library evaluation team reported that students: "pointed out that one of the limitations to developing a stronger more responsive library program was the lack of faculty involvement. They suggested stronger interaction between the faculty and the librarians."[133] In a separate evaluation in 1975, the student assistants felt that the program was personally valuable; they also indicated that too few students used their services when they staffed the reference desk at night.[134]

No reference or circulation statistics were kept during the course of the program, but by 1973 interlibrary loan requests had risen dramatically, requiring the full-time attention of one staff member.[135] Previously, requests had been handled as necessary by the reference librarian. Again, increased use cannot be attributed solely to the library program, but this has been noted in so many libraries after implementation of a library use instruction program that it cannot be denied to have had some effect on library use. The program also seems to have had a positive effect on the library staff; there is a feeling of more self-confidence and higher morale.[136]

It is interesting that the program at Wabash encountered the dichotomy between "content" and "method," as Knapp observed in her study some 10 to 15 years before. The main obstacle at Wabash is clearly faculty disinterest, if not outright hostility. Even though the program has not been an unqualified success; it has continued and enjoys some support from the faculty. Better communications between faculty and librarians will certainly have to be worked out if the program is to expand into something more directly concerned with all levels of students.

University of Colorado

The developers of the library use instruction program at this institution were guided by the assumption "that improvements (or change) in student library use skills of a significant scope can come only by librarians working with and through the faculty in the teaching classroom."[137] The librarians hoped to encourage library use by teaching in the classroom and also to promote efficent use by teaching literature searching techniques.[138]

To implement these goals, a 5-year grant was obtained from the CLR-NEH Program; the program was began in the fall of 1973. Librarians with advanced degrees in history and economics were hired to start a library instruction program within the academic departments of their specializations. These subject reference librarians were to work half-time within these respective departments (in office space with the regular teaching faculty), and half-time in the reference department of the undergraduate social science and humanities library.

In their departments, the librarians made extensive faculty contacts, resulting in the inclusion of library use instruction in several courses. There was an attempt to provide a sequential pattern of instruction. Specific reference tools were taught in accordance with the academic level of the course; teaching

search skills was the real objective of the instruction.[139] The librarians helped prepare study guides and special bibliographies and assisted the regular faculty in evaluating the bibliographic quality of students' work. This portion of the program was designed to demonstrate to both students and faculty the importance of bibliographic instruction. The librarians held individual meetings with students outside of class and served as ombudsmen for the library.

In 1973-74, the economics librarian gave bibliographic instruction to approximately 1000 students in various economics classes and received about 400 requests from students outside of class for assistance in library-related work.[140] In an attempt to develop an ongoing evaluation, the economics librarian gave a questionnaire to a class of 190 students in the fall of 1973 before giving any library use instruction. After a semester of instruction, the same questionnaire was given to the same students. Comparison of the two sets shows a definite shift in student attitudes. The second questionnaire reflected an increase in the number of students who felt confident in doing research in the library but there was also a significant increase in the number of students who believed they were missing sources of information while doing research in the library. (There was also, however, a significant decrease in the "don't know" responses.[141]) These results were interpreted by the librarians to mean that the instruction may have had a positive effect on students' library use and that the economics librarian may have succeeded in demonstrating the true complexity of information retrieval. (This response is similar to one recorded among Earlham College students. As part of a study to determine the extent of use of historical journals in liberal arts colleges, a doctoral student conducted a survey which found that Earlham history students "were...familiar with the bibliographical materials in American history, yet, paradoxically, they did not feel as confident as [students at other colleges] in their ability to use the library." Earlham librarians interpreted this to mean that their students were "painfully" aware of the complexities of library use.[142])

The history librarian, hired in 1974, created a similar program in the history department at University of Colorado. In the second year of the program, both subject librarians reported that when they were in the reference department of the library they were often monopolized by students from their academic departments. "An obvious reason for this demand would be their ineffective preparation of classroom assignments for use by classes with whom they met."[143]

One of the major efforts of the program is to develop an ongoing evaluation system. Though not part of the original proposed program, this is viewed as important not only to the librarians at Colorado, but to all librarians involved in library use instruction.[144] The evaluation consists of 2 different questionnaires sent to students and faculty. Student questionnaires are sent to all economics and history students and to a random sample of undergraduates. Faculty questionnaires are sent to all economics and history professors and to a random sample of the faculty. These were distributed in spring 1975 and the survey will be repeated again in 1977. The survey will show: "how the grant has affected information use patterns. The response from the various subgroups (inside and outside the grant program) will allow for 'before' and 'after' comparisons."[145]

The student questionnaires are designed to determine how students approach the problem of literature searching, rather than to test knowledge of specific reference sources. The questionnaire lists several procedures, for which the

students are to indicate a response.[146] Tabulations of results obtained from the random sample of students surveyed in 1975 indicate that most students have inefficient search strategies. For example, when asked what they do after having selected a term paper topic, 81% indicated that they usually went to the subject card catalog to find relevant books.

The faculty questionnaire is a lengthy, detailed survey to discover both faculty attitudes toward actual methods of library use instruction and their perceptions of students' library skills. Tabulations of the 1975 survey that have been completed show somewhat surprising figures. Results of responses from both the random sample and the history and economics sample showed, for instance, that 80.8% agreed that formal library instruction was a key factor in improving student library skills, 82.2% agreed that a review of undergraduate reference sources conducted for the faculty would be useful, and 69.4% indicated that they would participate in such a review if it were offered.[147]

These questionnaires seem to be well designed for measuring attitudes of both students and faculty. The final results of the 1975 survey will be interesting to compare with the 1977 survey. More special funding is being sought to continue this evaluative effort, which represents one of the most ambitious attempts to develop a truly useful evaluative technique for library use instruction programs.

In addition to the evaluation effort, the Colorado program is unique in that its subject librarians work in the immediate vicinity of the teaching faculty. It is possible that this idea stemmed from the findings of the Monteith College Project, which indicated that the librarians were never actually accepted as part of the teaching team by regular faculty members. It was postulated that this was due to the fact that the librarians were removed from informal contacts with regular faculty. Librarians only attended formal faculty meetings which seemed to consist of the formal approval of decisions actually made previously during various informal contacts among regular faculty, contacts from which the librarians were excluded.[148] Having librarians within the physical proximity of faculty appears to be a way of producing much closer contact and communication. Such a scheme obviously requires available space, a department willing to experiment and librarians with time to be outside the library.

It is too early to give any definite evaluation of this program. Dedicated to course-related, sequential library instruction, the librarians nonetheless realize that simply getting into the classroom is not enough:

> That is to say, while we are exposing the students to good library skills, will the instructors demand that students consistently display these skills?...Without follow through or expectation on the part of the faculty there is little reason for the student to perform beyond the basic level of library use--and as a result there is little reason or basis from which librarians can move students up to more sophisticated levels of literature searching.[149]

This is a problem that is rarely discussed.

The Colorado program has clearly drawn on previous experiments and its goals and objectives are well defined. Its evaluation effort would appear to be one of the most significant of its kind, and the results (including the 1977 evaluation) will, one hopes, be made available to all.

PATTERNS AND PROBLEMS

It is clear from the above descriptions that there is little uniformity in approach to library use instruction. However, some general patterns can be observed.

First, a positive relationship may exist between the amount of student library use and library use instruction. The recorded increase in both interlibrary loans and "in-depth" reference questions after the introduction of instruction programs further suggests a positive relationship between library use instruction and effective library use. However, this latter relationship needs to be explored more carefully. The Colorado evaluation program is certainly important in these terms.

Second, it appears that course-related instruction enjoys more popularity than separate courses, at least among the institutions surveyed here. However, many programs described here seem to concentrate mainly on freshmen. It seems doubtful that a single exposure to library instruction is enough (even if it is course-related), but in larger schools it may be impossible to do otherwise for the students. Required instruction at the freshman level may at least establish contact between librarians and students; this might make students less hesitant to ask for help in the future. However, this seems less than satisfactory as a result.

Third, it appears that any kind of library use instruction requires either more library personnel and/or time specifically allocated for instruction. Obviously the extent of library instruction is determined by the number of librarians available to give instruction. Most programs described here entailed the hiring of additional personnel[150] which clearly required a financial commitment. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education suggests that if libraries wish to become more active participants in education, they will need larger budgets, perhaps double the current amounts.[151] This seems to be unrealistic. Many of the programs discussed here originally began with outside funding, but this does not seem absolutely necessary. Probably this is possible only if the entire professional staff can be involved in instructional programs. It is encouraging to note that several institutions have continued funding library use instruction programs after initial grant money has ended.

Fourth, in order to receive financial support, librarians must cultivate support among the faculty members in their institutions. Given the influence of coursework on student library use and the fact that most political and academic power in an institution rests with the regular faculty, librarians cannot ignore the necessity for better communication with faculty members.[152] Most of the programs described here began with a small but interested group of faculty participants. Interestingly, one of these programs seems to concentrate almost completely on educating the faculty to take on the responsibility of library use instruction. This does not, however, seem to be a common viewpoint; rather, most programs appear to have an unstated goal of increasing the library's visibility on campus--which usually means getting the librarian into the classroom.

The librarian in the classroom raises the fifth observation: the necessity of faculty status for librarians. Faculty status could possibly give librarians more

prestige among students, and even more power in the political and academic structure of a college or university. However, such status will not by itself change attitudes about the need for library use instruction. Of more importance may be the academic credentials of librarians. Librarians often claim to be in a position of having a broader view of the curriculum and educational objectives of their institutions. Thus, they claim they can understand the need for library use instruction, can identify the courses where it will be most useful, and so on. However, this can only be substantiated if librarians can claim some expertise in particular subject areas. Librarians with master's or doctoral degrees in an area other than library science will possibly be better able to speak convincingly of the need for library instruction, having had exposure to both sides of the question. This seems to be an important element of the programs at Swarthmore and University of Colorado.

Some of the programs discussed undertake the training of students in the hope that this will encourage other students to approach the reference desk. Although there is no proof for or against this theory, the experience at Brown suggests that the use of student assistants has a minimal impact on student library use. Thus, a sixth observation is that such programs need more careful scrutiny. Perhaps programs in the planning stage should avoid any great commitment of resources to the training of student assistants until their real usefulness is known.

This raises the seventh observation: few programs are undertaking thorough evaluations. With one exception all of the programs discussed here have done only subjective evaluations of their programs. Design and implementation of a meaningful evaluation is obviously time-consuming, expensive, and difficult--particularly as few librarians have the necessary background for such work. However, that evaluation is necessary should be more than obvious. If, for instance, positive correlations can be established between library use instruction and academic performance, librarians will be in a much stronger position to obtain the support needed to implement and maintain library use instruction programs.

Are there any viable alternatives to formal programs of library use instruction as described here? The use of improved point-of-use devices, expanded reference services, etc., may improve student library use, and it is certain that competent librarians will always be a necessity. A different approach to traditional, printed guides may be an alternative. The use of "Library Pathfinders" is a significant development.[153] Originally developed by Project Intrex/Model Library Program at M.I.T., these guides are now commercially available at a very low cost, which includes reproduction rights. (Their commercial distribution was apparently a result of high demand.[154]) "Pathfinders" are not bibliographies on a subject; rather they are designed for the beginning student doing research in an unfamiliar area. Each "Pathfinder" (of which there are several in each of the disciplinary areas) is devoted to a fairly specific topic and lists in a prescribed order appropriate subject headings, standard works, guides and bibliographies, periodical indexes and abstracting services, etc. They are designed for use in the order in which each group or type of resource appears. Possibly, if there were enough "Pathfinders" on hundreds of topics, and if students used them over a period of time, the general principles of bibliographic structure and search strategies would become clear. However, they are subject to the same criticism as that given to point-of-use aids and traditional printed guides: availability and distribution do not guarantee use. To rely on such guides to provide library

use instruction seems unwise; however, they would definitely be useful in reinforcing actual instruction.

Librarians are clearly showing increasing interest in library use instruction as a way of improving their own position and of making a more positive contribution to students' education. Despite all this activity, it is disconcerting that few of the programs described here can be labeled resounding successes. Part of the problem, of course, is that there have been few measures of success or failure that are really meaningful. Nevertheless, it is clear that the notion of the library as an active educational force on campus has been fairly well established--at least among librarians. The appeal of this concept to librarians is as apparent as are the obstacles to its implementation.

Final paper submitted December 1977

REFERENCES

1. White, Carl M. "Services to Scholars," Library Trends 3:153, Oct. 1954.

2. Phipps, Barbara H. "Library Instruction for the Undergraduate," College & Research Libraries 29:411-23, Sept. 1968.

3. Ibid., pp. 422-23.

4. Young, Arthur P., et al. Survey of User Education in New York State Academic Libraries. Bethesda, Md., ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1971 p. 9. (ED 055 621)

5. Loutitt, C.M., and Patrick, James R. "A Study of Students' Knowledge in the Use of the Library," Journal of Applied Psychology 16:475-84, Oct. 1932.

6. See, for example, Hurt, Peyton. "The Need of College and University Instruction in Use of the Library," Library Quarterly 4:436-48, July 1934; Reed, Lulu R. "A Test of Students' Competence to Use the Library," Library Quarterly 8:256-83, April 1938; _____. "Do Colleges Need Reference Service?" Library Quarterly 13:232-40, July 1943; Lancaster, John H. The Use of the Library by Student Teachers: Some Factors Related to the Use of the Library by Student Teachers in Thirty-one Colleges in the area of the North Central Association. New York, Columbia University Teachers' College, 1941; Perkins, Ralph. The Prospective Teacher's Knowledge of Library Fundamentals. New York, Scarecrow Press, 1965; Alexander, Malcolm D. A Measure of the Library Skills of High School Graduates of Washington State as Demonstrated by Freshmen of Central Washington State College. Master's thesis, Central Washington State College, 1972. (ED 081 441); and Mann, Peter H. "Communication About Books to Undergraduates," Aslib Proceedings 26:250-56, June 1974. Nearly every writer on library use instruction agrees on the lack of student knowledge of the library.

7. The issues involved here have received attention for some time, as shown by the dates of the studies cited above. The fairly recent proliferation of publications on library use instruction is probably due more to the rapid growth of colleges and universities in the 1960s than to any lack of perception of the problem by librarians.

As early as 1936 a report concluded that students performed poorly in the library and that library use instruction was not as effective as it should be. The author recommended that instructional duties be the sole responsibility of at least one librarian per college; cost estimates were also provided. See Little, Evelyn S. Instruction in the Use of Books and Libraries in Colleges and Universities. Chicago, ALA, 1938. In 1946 the ALA/ACRL College and University Postwar Planning Committee recommended that more attention be paid to library use instruction; the committee also suggested that librarians be hired specifically for this purpose. See ALA/ACRL College and University Postwar Planning Committee. College and University Libraries and Librarianship. Chicago, ALA, 1946, pp. 46-47.

8. Branscomb, B. Harvie. Teaching With Books: A Study of College Libraries. Chicago, Association of American Colleges and ALA, 1940, p. 52.

9. Ibid., p. 53.

10. Ibid., pp. 54-80.

11. Knapp, Patricia B. "College Teaching and the Library," Illinois Libraries 40:831, Dec. 1958. For the complete study, see _____. "The Role of the Library of a Given College in Implementing the Course and Non-Course Objectives of that College." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1957.

12. _____, "College Teaching and the Library," op. cit., p. 832.

13. Ibid., pp. 832-33.

14. Ibid., p. 833.

15. Ibid., p. 831. Another study has found that the personal characteristics of students did not prove to have a significant influence on library use; the study concluded that instructors were the major factor in student library use. See Hostrop, Richard W. "The Relationship of Academic Success and Selected Other Factors to Student Use of Library Materials at College of the Desert." Ed.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1966. John Lubans, Jr. also found that nonuse of the library is related to course work; see Lubans, John, Jr. "A Survey of the Non-Users of a Technological University Library." In C.M. Lincoln, ed. Educating the Library User: Proceedings of the Fourth Triennial Meeting, International Association of Technological University Libraries. Loughborough, England, Loughborough University, 1970, pp. J1-J18. See also _____. "Nonuse of an Academic Library," College & Research Libraries 32:362-67, Sept. 1971.

16. Johnson, B. Lamar. Vitalizing a College Library. Chicago, ALA, 1939. Once much-touted as an example of the "library-college," the head of readers' services at Stephens states that there is no "formal library instruction program" at the present time: Todd, Joanna (Head, Readers' Services, Stephens College Library). Personal communication, Jan. 19, 1976.

17. Brown, Helen M. "The Librarian as Teacher in the College Library," College & Research Libraries 10:122, April 1949.

18. Whitten, Joseph N. "Relationship of College Instruction to Libraries in Seventy-two Liberal Arts Colleges." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1958.

19. See Knapp, Patricia B. The Monteith College Library Experiment. New York, Scarecrow Press, 1966.

20. _____. "A Suggested Program of College Instruction in the Use of the Library," Library Quarterly 26:224, July 1956.

21. _____. "The Library's Response to Innovation in Higher Education," California Librarian 29:146, April 1968.

22. For a discussion of the Earlham program, see Farber, Evan I. "Library Instruction Throughout the Curriculum: Earlham College Program." In John Lubans, Jr., ed. Educating the Library User. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1974, pp. 145-62.

23. This finding is discussed in more detail in the section of this paper on the program at the University of Colorado. See also Knapp, Patricia B. "The Methodology and Results of the Monteith Pilot Project," Library Trends 13:84-102, July 1964.

24. _____, "A Suggested Program...," op. cit., p. 225.

25. For a discussion of the pros and cons of course-related instruction, see Rader, Hannelore B. "Formal Courses in Bibliography," in Lubans, op. cit, pp. 279-86; and Kennedy, James. "Question: A Separate Course in Bibliography or Course-Related Instruction?" In Sul H. Lee, ed. Library Orientation (Papers presented at the First Conference on Library Orientation, Eastern Michigan University, May 7, 1971). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1972, pp. 18-28. For a description of the separate course at UCLA (which is a programmed instruction course tailored to individual interests), see Dudley, Miriam. "Teaching Library Skills to College Students," Advances in Librarianship 3:83-105, 1972. For a description of the separate course at Berkeley, see Shain, Charles. "Bibliography I: The U.C. Berkeley Experience." In Instruction in the Use of the College and University Library: Selected Conference Papers from July 13-14, 1970 Conference/Workshop. Berkeley, Calif., University of California, School of Librarianship, 1970, pp. 4-5. (ED 045 103)

26. Rader, op. cit., p. 280.

27. Phipps, op. cit., p. 423.

28. This belief is shared by many librarians, but for a particularly good discussion of this situation, see Snyder, Luella. The Second Kind of Knowledge. Syracuse, N.Y., Inter-university Program in Teacher Education & School of Library Science, Syracuse University, 1964.

29. In addition to the other studies cited above, see Young, Arthur P. "Research on Library-User Education: A Review Essay" In Lubans, op. cit., pp. 4-7.

30. Nelson, Jerold. "Faculty Awareness and Attitudes Toward Academic Library Reference Services: A Measure of Communication," College & Research Libraries 34:274-75, Sept. 1973.

31. Samore, Theodore. "College and University Library Statistics." In Nada B. Glick and Sarah L. Prakken, eds. Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information. 22d ed. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1977, p. 266.

32. Palmer, Millicent C. "Why Academic Library Orientation?" In Lee, op. cit., p. 2.

33. Kirk, Thomas G. "A Comparison of Two Methods of Library Instruction for Students in Introductory Biology," College & Research Libraries 32:465-74, Nov. 1971; Axeen, Marina E. Teaching Library Use to Undergraduates--Comparison of Computer-Based Instruction and the Conventional Lecture. Final Report. Urbana, University of Illinois, 1967. (ED 014 316); and McCoy, Ralph E. "Automation in Freshman Library Instruction," Wilson Library Bulletin 36:468-70, Feb. 1962.

34. Kuo, Frank F. "A Comparison of Six Versions of Science Library Instruction," College & Research Libraries 34:287-90, July 1973.

35. Melum, Verna V. "Library Instruction in a University," Illinois Libraries 51:511-21, June 1969.

36. The program at UCLA provides an individualized approach; see Dudley, op. cit. For a discussion of the disadvantages of such methods, see Stoffle, Carla J., and Bonn, Gabriella. "An Inventory of Library Orientation and Instruction Methods," RQ 13:129-33, Winter 1973. For a description of computer-assisted catalog use instruction in two university libraries, see Blume, Julie. "Instruction in Catalog Use." Master's diss., University of Chicago, 1975, pp. 61-69.

37. Passarelli, Anne B., and Abell, Millicent D. "Programs of Undergraduate Libraries and Problems in Educating Library Users." In Lubans, op. cit., p. 126. On the other hand, some see faculty status as strengthening the teaching role of librarians. See Howell, Benita J., et al. "Fleeting Encounters--A Role Analysis of Reference Librarian-Patron Interaction," RQ 16:124-29, Winter 1976.

38. Breivik, Patricia S. "A Rose by Any Other Name--Or Library Instruction and the Library School." In Lubans, op. cit., pp. 410-14.

39. Snider, Felix E. "The Relationships of Library Ability to Performance in College." Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois, 1965; and Joyce, William D. "A Study of Academic Achievement and Performance on a Test of Library Understandings," Journal of Educational Research 54:198-99, Jan. 1961. Knapp found some correlation between "exposure" to library use instruction and grade point average, but felt that the sample was too small to make any firm conclusions. She recommended better controls on a repeat study. See Knapp, The Monteith College Library Experiment, op. cit., p. 50.

40. Young, "Research on Library-User Education," op. cit., p. 10. See also Beeler, Richard J., ed. Evaluating Library Use Instruction (papers presented at the University of Denver Conference on the Evaluation of Library Use Instruction). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1975.

41. For a more detailed discussion of the library-college concept, see Shores, Louis. Library-College USA. Tallahassee, Fla., South Pass Press, 1970; _____, et al., eds. The Library-College. Philadelphia, Drexel Press, 1966; and Terwilliger, Gloria H. "The Library-College: A Movement for Experimental and Innovative Learning Concepts; Applications and Implications for Higher Education." 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 1975.

42. Ibid., vol. 2.

43. Evrard, Connie F., et al. "Graduate Reference Assistants at Brown University." In Lubans, op. cit., pp. 368-75.

44. Ibid., p. 369.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid.

47. As of Nov. 1975, the final report on the program had not been written; the program's current status is unknown to this author: Elizabeth Schumann (Reference Librarian, John D. Rockefeller Library, Brown University). Personal communication, Nov. 21, 1975.

48. Evrard, op. cit., pp. 374-75.

49. Ibid., p. 372.

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid., p. 373.

52. "Fourth Interim Report to the Council on Library Resources." Lexington, Va., Washington and Lee University, 1975, p. 2.

53. "Grant Proposal to the Council on Library Resources." Lexington, Va., Washington and Lee University, 1971, p. 4.

54. Ibid., p. 5.

55. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

56. Ibid., p. 8.

57. Ibid., p. 2.

58. "Second Interim Report to the Council on Library Resources." Lexington, Va., Washington and Lee University, 1973, p. 10.

59. "Fourth Interim Report...," op. cit., p. 7.

60. "First Interim Report to the Council on Library Resources." Lexington, Va., Washington and Lee University, 1972, p. 7.

61. Coulling, Sidney B. (Reference Coordinator, Washington and Lee University). Quoted in "Second Interim Report...," op. cit., p. 11.

62. Farber, op. cit., pp. 156-57. For an argument for library instruction taught by regular faculty, see Clark, Virginia. "Teaching Students to Use the Library: Whose Responsibility?" College & Research Libraries 21:369-72, Sept. 1960.

63. "Grant Proposal...," op. cit., p. 3.

64. Tashjean, Catherine T. (Director of the Library, Manhattanville College, Purchase, New York). Personal communication, Nov. 10, 1975.

65. Ibid.

66. Ibid.

67. Ibid.

68. See Palmer, Millicent. "Problems in Academic Library Instruction: Our Own Creation?" Catholic Library World 43:447-52, April 1972.

69. Campbell, John D. "Annual Report, 1974-75 (to the National Endowment for the Humanities)." Los Angeles, Occidental College, 1975, pp. 1-2.

70. Ibid., p. 3.

71. Ibid., p. 5.

72. Ibid.

73. Harmsen, Tyrus G. "Report for the Year July 1, 1974-June 30, 1975 (to the National Endowment for the Humanities)." Los Angeles, Occidental College, 1975, p. 2.

74. "Report to the Council on Library Resources Project 1971-1972." New Orleans, La., Dillard University, 1972, p. 1.

75. Ibid., p. 2.

76. Ibid.

77. "Annual Report to the Council on Library Resources 1972-1973." New Orleans, La., Dillard University, 1973, p. 5.

78. Ibid., p. 3.

79. "Final Report to the Council on Library Resources." New Orleans, La., Dillard University, 1975, p. 4.

80. Ibid.

81. "Report to the Council...," op. cit., p. 1.

82. Ibid., p. 2.

83. "Final Report to the Council...," op. cit., p. 1.

84. Taylor, Carole (Head Librarian, Dillard University). Personal communication, Nov. 10, 1975.

85. Forbis, Yates M. (Director of the Library, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penna.). Personal communication, Nov. 6, 1975.

86. Ibid.

87. Harris, Virginia B. (Head Reference Librarian, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio). Personal communication, Dec. 17, 1975

88. Ibid.

89. Ibid.

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid.

92. Ibid.

93. Wells, Marion (Head of Public Services, Library, State University College at Brockport/SUNY, Brockport, N.Y.). Personal communication, Nov. 12, 1975.

94. Ibid.

95. See the section in this paper on Dillard University. A librarian involved in the program at Wabash College also feels that additional staffing will be required with programs of this kind. See Millis, Charlotte H. "Developing Awareness: A Behavioral Approach." In Lubans, op. cit., pp. 350-63.

96. Kuo, op. cit., pp. 287-90.

97. See Wells, Marion, et al. "A Library Instructional Program for 200 Freshmen, Planned as a 3-Phase Project," LOEX News, Sept. 1975, p. 3.

98. Wells, personal communication, op. cit.

99. "Report of the Special Committee on Library Policy." In Critique of a College. Swarthmore, Penna., Swarthmore College, 1967, pp. 338-39.

100. Ibid., p. 350.

101. Ibid., p. 341.

102. Ibid., pp. 355-56.

103. Press, Richard. "Draft Answers to Questionnaires from the National Endowment for the Humanities." Swarthmore, Penna., Swarthmore Colllege, 1975, pp. 1-2.

104. See "Report of the Commission on Educational Policy." In Critique of a College, op. cit., pp. 76, 96; and "Report of the Special Committee on Library Policy," op. cit., p. 352.

105. Hinz, James A. "Establish Experimentally the Position of Division Librarian in the Humanities." In Selected Project Descriptions: Higher Education. Washington, D.C., National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Education Programs, 1975, p. 121.

106. _____ (Humanities Librarian, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Penna.). Personal communication, Dec. 19, 1975.

107. _____. "Special Report to the Council on Library Resources, Inc., on Swarthmore College Program to Establish Experimentally the Position of Divisional Librarian in the Humanities." Swarthmore, Penna., Swarthmore College, 1975, p. 3.

108. "Library-Faculty Partnership: A Proposal Submitted to the Council on Library Resources." Richmond, Va., University of Richmond, 1973, p. 1.

109. Ibid., p. 2.

110. Ibid., p. 3.

111. Ibid., p. 4.

112. Robinson, Dennis E. (University Librarian, University of Richmond). "Memorandum to the Council of Deans and the Library Committee on Future Development of the University Library." Richmond, Va., University of Richmond, Oct. 30, 1975, p. 3.

113. Ibid., pp. 19-20.

114. Rader, Hannelore B. "Five-Year Library Outreach Orientation Program: Final Report." Ypsilanti, Mich., Eastern Michigan University, Center of Educational Resources, [1975], p. 1.

115. Ibid., p. 2.

116. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

117. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

118. Ibid., p. 4.

119. Ibid.

120. Ibid., p. 8.

121. Ibid., p. 10.

122. Ibid., pp. 9-10.

123. Ibid., p. 6.

124. _____. Personal communication, Dec. 16, 1975.

125. Ordinarily such a program would have been funded under the CLR-NEH Program, but Wabash College does not accept federal funds.

126. "A Proposal to Increase the Effectiveness of the Library in the Educational Program of Wabash College." Crawfordsville, Ind., Wabash College, 1970, p. 1.

127. Ibid., p. 2.

128. "Faculty Questionnaire." Crawfordsville, Ind., Wabash College, 1975.

129. The library hired a media specialist to institute media services (a program not included in the grant program); this position was apparently discontinued because of faculty disapproval. The dispute over faculty status is reported in Wedgeworth, Robert, and Jones, James V. "Evaluation of the Lilly Library, Wabash College, Feb. 27-March 1, 1974." Crawfordsville, Ind., Wabash College, 1974, p. 2. The Wabash College 1974/75 Freshmen Catalog lists the technical services librarian as having the rank of instructor and the reference librarian as assistant professor. Presumably the librarians won faculty status.

130. Thompson, Donald R. (Librarian, Wabash College). Text of an address delivered at the conference, "On the Second Knowledge--A Conference on Bibliographic Instruction," sponsored by the ALA of Ohio, College of Wooster, April 24-25, 1975.

131. Wedgeworth and Jones, op. cit., p. 4.

132. "Student Evaluation Questionnaires." Crawfordsville, Ind., Wabash College, 1975.

133. Wedgeworth and Jones, op. cit., p. 3.

134. "Student Assistant Evaluation Questionnaires." Crawfordsville, Ind., Wabash College, 1975.

135. Thompson, Donald R. Personal communication, June 10, 1975.

136. Ibid.

137. Lubans, John, Jr. "First Annual Report to the Council on Library Resources and the National Endowment for the Humanities: Program to Improve and Increase Student and Faculty Involvement in Library Use." Boulder, Colo., University of Colorado Libraries, 1974, p. 1.

138. Ibid.

139. Edwards, Susan. "Proposed Program for the Economics Department." In Lubans, "First Annual Report...," op. cit., Appendix.

140. Lubans, "First Annual Report...," op. cit., pp. 5-7.

141. See Farber, op. cit., p. 159.

142. For sample questions, statistics and interpretations, see Lubans, "First Annual Report...," op. cit., pp. 5-7.

143. _____. "Second Annual Progress Report to the Council on Library Resources and the National Endowment for the Humanities: Program to Improve and Increase Student and Faculty Involvement in Library Use." Boulder, Colo., University of Colorado Libraries, 1975, p. 1.

144. Ibid., p. 2.

145. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

146. Ibid., pp. 3-8.

147. Ibid., pp. 8-13.

148. Knapp, "The Methodology and Results of the Monteith Pilot Project," op. cit.

149. Lubans, "Second Annual Progress Report...," op. cit., p. 2.

150. A Committee of the Library Association of Australia recommends having one librarian assigned to instruction, to teach 10 hours a week, with no more than 1000 students per librarian. See Manning, D.J., ed. "Report of a Committee of the University and College Libraries Section of the Library Association of Australia Appointed

to Examine the Requirements for Reader Education Activities in Universities and Colleges," Australian Academic and Research Libraries (Monograph Supplement), Dec. 1973, vol. 4, pp. 11-13.

151. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Reform on Campus: Changing Students, Changing Academic Programs. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1972, p. 50.

152. For an interesting report on librarians and faculty communication, see Morris, Jacquelyn M. "Gaining Faculty Acceptance and Support of Library Instruction: A Case Study." In Hannelore B. Rader, ed. Faculty Involvement in Library Instruction: Their Views in Support of Academic Library Use Instruction. Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1976, pp. 57-73.

153. For a discussion of "Library Pathfinders" and their development, see Stevens, Charles H., et al. "Library Pathfinders: A New Possibility for Cooperative Reference Service," College & Research Libraries 34:40-46, Jan. 1973.

154. Ibid., p. 43.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

As a general rule, I have excluded in the following bibliography: (1) non-English language material, (2) unpublished reports from various programs, (3) brief articles that are primarily news reports on programs, (4) publications dealing with library use instruction in a particular subject area or for a particular category of students, and (5) purely hortatory material. Many items listed include extensive bibliographies or are themselves bibliographies.

For news and more up-to-date information, Project LOEX at Eastern Michigan University publishes LOEX News and supplies information and material on programs instituted by its member libraries. There are also at least 10 regional groups in the United States and Canada sponsoring workshops and/or issuing newsletters. Information on library use instruction programs abroad appears in publications of national library organizatons and IFLA.

Reference Services Review has included an annual "Bibliography on Library Orientation" since 1974 (see Rader and Delgado, below) and has also published a checklist of bibliographic instruction literature covering the years 1931-75 (see Krier, below). The annual feature contains foreign publications.

An annual conference, "Library Orientation for Academic Libraries," has been sponsored since 1971 by the Center of Educational Resources at Eastern Michigan University. Proceedings of these conferences are published; those issued to date are listed below.

The Annual Report of the Council on Library Resources reports on those institutions receiving grants under the College Library Program (jointly funded with the National Endowment for the Humanities begun in 1970) and grants awarded under the council's Library Service Enhancement Program (begun in 1976). Usually, announcements of awards also appear in College & Research Libraries News.

Several subdivisions of ALA are involved with library use instruction: the ALA Committee on Instruction in the Use of Libraries; the ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Section; the ACRL Community and Junior College Section, Committee on Instruction and Use; and the ALA Library Instruction Roundtable.

ACRL Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction. Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Status Report 1972. Bethesda, Md., ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1973. (ED 072 823)

ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Task Force. "Draft Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries," College & Research Libraries News 37:301, Dec. 1976.

_____. "Toward Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries," College & Research Libraries News 36:137-39, 169-71, May 1975.

Abbott, John C., and Kaser, David. "The Coordination of Faculty Services," College & Research Libraries 17:13-15, 40, Jan. 1956.

Allen, Marian N. "Spacious Closet of Reading." In Winifred B. Linderman, ed. Present Status and Future Prospects of Reference/Information Service. Chicago, ALA, 1967, pp. 34-47.

Alsmeyer, Henry L., and Grimes, Joseph L. "Graduate Administrative Assistants," RQ 9:149-50, Winter 1969.

Alston, Annie M. "The Happy Medium in Library Instruction at the College Level," College & Research Libraries 21:469-70, Nov. 1960.

bartlett, Beatrice C. "Stephens College Library Instruction Program," ALA Bulletin 58:311-14, April 1, 1964.

Bergen, Dan, and Daryea, E.D., eds. Libraries and the College Climate of Learning. Syracuse, N.Y., Syracuse University Press, 1966.

Bolner, Mary, ed. Planning and Developing a Library Orientation Program: Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries. Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1975.

Bonn, George. "Training Laymen in the Use of the Library." In Ralph Shaw, ed. State of the Library Art. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University, Graduate School of Library Science, 1960.

Bunge, Charles. "Library Education and Reference Performance," Library Journal 92:1578-81, April 15, 1967.

Butterfield, Mary B. "Project LOEX Means Library Orientation Exchange," RQ 13:39-42, Fall 1973.

Carey, R.J.P. Library Guiding: A Program for Exploiting Library Resources. Hamden, Conn., Shoestring Press, 1974.

Clark, Alice S., and Pepple, Howard. "The Use of Graduate Assistants: Academic Subject Reference," RQ 8:240-41, Summer 1969.

Cowley, John, ed. Libraries in Higher Education. Hamden, Conn., Linnet Books, 1975.

Delgado, Hannelore Rader. "Library Orientation and Instruction--1975: An Annotated Review of the Literature," Reference Services Review 4:91-93, Oct./Dec. 1976.

Devlin, Eleanor. "Thoughts on Freshmen Orientation," Catholic Library World 29:23-27, Oct. 1957.

Dillon, Howard W. "Organizing the Academic Library for Instruction," Journal of Academic Librarianship 1:4-7, Sept. 1975.

Durey, Peter. "University Library Services to Undergraduates," International Library Review 5:321-27, July 1973.

Dyson, Allan J. "Organizing Undergraduate Library Instruction: The English and American Experience," Journal of Academic Librarianship 1:9-13, March 1975.

Ford, Geoffrey. "Progress in Documentation: Research in User Behaviour in University Libraries," Journal of Documentation 29:85-106, March 1973.

Fox, Peter. Reader Instruction Methods in Academic Libraries 1973 (Cambridge University Library Librarianship Series). Cambridge, The University Library, 1974.

Genung, Harriett. "Can Machines Teach the Use of the Library?" College & Research Libraries 28:25-30, Jan. 1967.

Givens, Johnnie. "The Use of Resources in the Learning Experience," Advances in Librarianship 4:149-74, 1974.

Gore, Daniel. "Anachronistic Wizard: The College Reference Librarian," Library Journal 89:1688-92, April 15, 1964.

Griffin, L.W., and Clarke, J.A. "Orientation and Instruction of Graduate Students in the Use of the University Library: A Survey," College & Research Libraries 33:467-72, Nov. 1972.

Gwynn, Stanley E. "The Liberal Arts Function of the University Library," Library Quarterly 34:311-21, Oct. 1954.

Hartz, Frederic R. "Freshmen Library Orientation: A Need for New Approaches," College & Research Libraries 26:227-31, May 1965.

Hernon, Peter. "Library Lectures and Their Evaluation: A Survey," Journal of Academic Librarianship 1:14-18, July 1975,

Hills, P.J. "Library Instruction and the Development of the Individual," Journal of Librarianship 6:255-63, Oct. 1974.

Holley, Edward G., and Oram, Robert W. "University Library Orientation by Television," College & Research Libraries 23:485-91, Nov. 1962.

"Integrating Library Instruction in the College Curriculum," Drexel Library Quarterly Vol. 7, July/Oct. 1971.

Josey, E.J. "The Role of the College Library Staff in Instruction in the Use of the Library," College & Research Libraries 23:492-98, Nov. 1962.

Keever, Ellen H., and Raymond, James C. "Integrated Library Instruction on the University Campus: Experiment at the University of Alabama," Journal of Academic Librarianship 2:185-87, Sept. 1976.

Kibbey, Ray A., and Weiner, Anthony M. "U.S.F. Library Lectures, Revisited," RQ 13:139-42, Winter 1973.

Kirkendall, Carolyn, ed. "Library Instruction: A Column of Opinion," Journal of Academic Librarianship 2:188-89, Sept. 1976. (First installment of a regular feature.)

Knapp, Patricia B. The Academic Library Response to New Directions in Graduate Education. Bethesda, Md., ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1970. (ED 039 390)

_____. "Involving the Library in an Integrated Learning Environment." In Dan Bergen and E.D. Duryea, eds. Libraries and the College Climate of Learning. Syracuse, N.Y., Syracuse University Press, 1966, pp. 21-35.

Krier, Maureen. "Bibliographic Instruction: A Checklist of the Literature, 1931-75," Reference Services Review 4:7-31, Jan./March 1976.

Lancaster, F.W. "User Education: The Next Major Thrust in Information Science?" Journal of Education for Librarianship 11:55-63, Summer 1970.

Larson, Dale M. A Systems Approach to Individualized Library Instruction. Bethesda, Md., ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1972. (ED 071 681)

Larson, Thelma E. "Public Onslaught: A Survey of User Orientation Methods," RQ 8:182-87, Spring 1969.

Lebovitch, J. College Libraries and Tutor Librarianship: An Annotated Select Bibliography. Hatfield, England, Hatfield Polytechnic, 1971. (ED 066 204)

Lee, Sul H., ed. A Challenge for Academic Libraries: How to Motivate Students to Use the Library; Papers Presented at the Second Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries. Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1973.

Le Moyne, W. Anderson. "Library Instruction at the University of Illinois in Chicago," Illinois Libraries 39:118-21, April 1957.

"Library Instruction: Methods, Materials, Evaluation." Drexel Library Quarterly Vol. 8, July 1972.

Library-Instructional Integration on the College Level (Report of the 40th Conference of Eastern College Librarians, Columbia University, Nov. 27, 1954; ACRL Monograph no. 13). Chicago, ACRL, 1955.

Line, Maurice B. "Student Attitudes to the University Library: A Survey at Southampton University," Journal of Documentation 19:100-17, Sept. 1963. Reports of a second survey were reported by the same author in Journal of Documentation 22:123-35, June 1966.

Lubans, John, Jr., ed. A Look at Library Use Instruction Programs: The Problems of Library Users and Non-Users. Boulder, Colo., University of Colorado Libraries, 1972. (ED 095 311)

Lyle, Guy R. The Administration of the College Library. 4th ed. New York, H.W. Wilson, 1974.

_____. The President, the Professor, and the College Library. New York, H.W. Wilson, 1963.

McComb, Ralph W. "Orientation and Library Instruction," Drexel Library Quarterly 2:248-49, July 1966.

Mackenzie, A. Graham. "Reader Instruction in Modern Universities," Aslib Proceedings 21:271-79, July 1969.

Melum, Verna V. "Library Instruction to 2000 Freshmen," College & Research Libraries 21:462-68, Nov. 1960.

_____. "A Survey to Aid Your Fall Planning: Library Orientation in the College and University," Wilson Library Bulletin 46:59-66, Sept. 1971.

Merrit, Georgetta. "Library Orientation for College Freshmen in the Small College During Orientation Week," Library Journal 81:1224-25, May 15, 1956.

Mews, Hazel. Reader Instruction in College and Universities: An Introductory Handbook. London, Clive Bingley Ltd., 1972.

Power, Ellen. "Instruction in the Use of Books and Libraries: Preliminary Report to the International Association of Technical University Libraries," Libri 14:253-63, 1964.

Pritchard, Hugh C. "A New Approach: Library Orientation," RQ 7:9-11, Fall 1967.

Pugh, L.C. "Library Instruction Programmes for Undergraduates: Historical Development and Current Practice," Library World 71:267-73, March 1970.

Rader, Hannelore B., ed. Academic Library Instruction: Objectives, Programs and Faculty Involvement: Papers of the Fourth Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries. Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1975.

_____. "Bibliography on Library Orientation--1974," Reference Services Review 3:29-31, Jan./March 1975.

_____. Library Instruction in the Seventies: State of the Art: Papers Presented at the Sixth Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries. Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1977.

_____. "Library Orientation and Instruction--1973: An Annotated Review of the Literature," Reference Services Review 2:91-93, Jan./March 1974.

Ranstead, Donald D., and Spencer, Sherman H. "Freshman Library Orientation Program," Library Journal 84:152-54, Jan. 15, 1959.

Reid, Bruce J. "Bibliographic Teaching in French and Politics at the University of Leicester," Journal of Librarianship 5:293-305, Oct. 1973.

Revill, D.H. "Teaching Methods in the Library: A Survey from the Educational Point of View," Library World 71:243-49, Feb. 1970.

Riley, Louise E. "A Study of the Performance on a Library Orientation Test in Relation to the Academic Achievement and Scholastic Aptitude of a Selected Group of

Freshmen College Students at Tuskegee Institute." Master's in L.S. diss., Atlanta Unversity, 1962.

Ritter, R. Vernon. "An Investigation of Classroom-Library Relationships on a College Campus as Seen in Recorded Circulation and GPAs," College & Research Libraries 29:30-40, Jan. 1968.

Schwartz, Phillip J. The New Media in Academic Library Orientation 1950-1972: An Annotated Bibliography. Stout, University of Wisconsin, 1973. (ED 071 682)

Scrivener, J.E. "Instruction in Library Use: The Persisting Problem," Australian Academic and Research Libraries 3:87-119, June 1972.

Sheehan, Helen. "The Library College Idea: Trend of the Future?" Library Trends 18:93-102, July 1969.

Simon, Dorothy B. "A More Human Approach to Instruction in the Use of Academic Libraries." In E.J. Josey, ed. New Dimensions for Academic Library Service. Metuchen, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1975, pp. 169-74.

Swope, Mary Jane, and Katzer, Jeffrey. "Why Don't They Ask Questions?" RQ 12:161-66, Winter 1972.

Taylor, Robert S. "A Coordinated Program of Library Instruction," College & Research Libraries 18:303-06, July 1957.

Tevis, Roy. "Academic Library Instruction: The Need for a New Breed," Catholic Library World 45:480-84, May 1974.

Tidmarsh, Mavis M. "Instruction in the Use of Academic Libraries." In William L. Saunders, ed. University and Research Library Studies. London, Pergamon Press, 1968, pp. 39-83.

Use, Mis-Use and Non-Use of Academic Libraries (Proceedings of the New York Library Association, College and University Section, Spring Conference, Jefferson Community College, Watertown, New York, May 1-2, 1970). Watertown, N.Y., New York Library Association, 1970.

Wendt, Paul. "New Library Materials and Technology for Instruction and Research," Library Trends 16:197-210, Oct. 1967.

Wiggins, Marvin E. "The Development of Library Use Instructional Programs," College & Research Libraries 33:473-79, Nov. 1972.

Wilkinson, Billy R. Reference Services for Undergraduate Students: Four Case Studies. Metuchen, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1972.

Wilson, Louis R. The Library in College Instruction. New York, H.W. Wilson, 1951.

Young, Arthur P. "Student Assistant and Reference Services: A Report and a Challenge," RQ 9:295-97, Summer 1970.

VITA

Stuart Miller is a graduate of Wabash College (B.A., 1971) and the University of Chicago (M.A.T., 1972, and M.A., Library Science, 1976). He is a member of the American Library Association and Beta Phi Mu. Mr. Miller is currently the information specialist with the Research and Technical Services Department of the International Association of Assessing Officers where he is responsible for the Property Tax Information Service.

In addition to several bibliographies and reports prepared for work-related assignments, Mr. Miller has also written book reviews for the Library Quarterly and the International Assessor, compiles the monthly "Publications" column for the latter magazine, and also contributed a short report on property taxation to New Directions in State and Local Tax Reform. In addition, he has authored a short essay on assessors and libraries for a forthcoming reference manual for local assessors, and is a contributor to the 1978 Municipal Yearbook.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS deal with any aspect of librarianship and consist of manuscripts which are too long or too detailed for publication in a library periodical or which are of specialized or temporary interest. Manuscripts for inclusion in this series are invited, and should be sent to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, Publications Office--249 Armory Building, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

Papers in this series are issued irregularly, and no more often than monthly. Subscriptions can be established for $7.00 per year. At least five papers will be issued annually, beginning with number 132 for 1978. Individual copies of current or back numbers may be ordered for $2.00 each (prepaid). Send orders to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, Publications Office--249 Armory Building, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, Champaign, Illinois 61820. Make checks payable to University of Illinois.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Rolland E. Stevens, Acting Editor
Linda Hoffman, Associate Editor

Hugh Atkinson
J.L. Divilbiss
D.W. Krummel
F.W. Lancaster
Jerome Miller
Selma Richardson